

**THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.**

EDINBURGH :

PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

Uttermere Institution Public Library
Acq. No. 5264 Date 28.12.71

052NOR
Vol. 17
(Pt. 2)

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

MAY.—AUGUST 1852.

VOL. XVII.

EDINBURGH:

W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET;

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.;

DUBLIN: JAMES M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCLII.

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXIV.

ART	Page
<p>I. Life of Lord Jeffrey: with a Selection from his Correspondence. By Lord Cockburn, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1852,</p>	283
<p>II. 1. The Birds of Australia. By John Gould, F.R.S., &c. 7 vols. imp. folio. London, 1848.</p> <p>2. An Introduction to the Birds of Australia. By the Same. 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1848.</p> <p>3. The Natural History of Ireland: Birds. By William Thompson, Esq., President of the Natural History and Philosophical Society of Belfast. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1849-51,</p>	327
<p>III. Scriptural Revision of the Liturgy, a Remedy for Anglican Assumption and Papal Aggression. A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M.P. By a Member of the Middle Temple. London, 1851,</p>	369
<p>IV. 1. Poems, Lyrical and Dramatic. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; with an Introductory Essay, by George Gilfillan. Liverpool, 1848.</p> <p>2. Poems. By Thomas Buchanan Read. Illustrated by Kenny Meadows. 12mo. London, 1852.</p> <p>3. Poems. By Edgar Allan Poe. Edited, with an Essay on his Life and Genius, by James Hannay. 8vo. London, 1852.</p> <p>4. The Poetical Works of William Cullen Bryant. 8 vols. London, 1850,</p>	394
<p>V. The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr; with Essays on his Character and Influence. By the Chevalier Bunsen and Professors Brandis and Loebell. 2 vols. London, 1852,</p>	422

ART.		Page
VI.	1. The Archæology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland. By Daniel Wilson, Honorary Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1851.	
	2. The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark. By J. J. A. Worsaae, &c. &c. Translated and applied to the illustration of similar Remains in England, by W. T. Thoms, F.S.A. Oxford, 1849.	
	3. Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd. By the Rev. W. B. Jones, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. London, 1851.	
	4. Remains of Pagan Saxondom, principally from Tumuli in England. By John Yonge Akerman, Fellow and Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Part I.,	459
VII.	1. Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature. By Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 2d edit. London, 1837.	
	2. Cautions for the Times: Addressed to the Parishioners of a Parish in England by their former Rector. Published occasionally: Seventeen Nos. 1851-52, . . .	481
VIII.	1. First Report of the Commissioners for the Exposition of 1851. London, 1852. 8vo, pp. 267; with Plates.	
	2. Education and Educational Institutions considered with reference to the Industrial Professions, and the Present Aspect of Society. By the Rev. J. Booth, LL.D., F.R.S., Chaplain to the Marquis of Lansdowne. London, 1846. 8vo, pp. 108.	
	3. Papers relating to Proposals for Establishing Colleges of Arts and Manufactures for the Better Instruction of the Industrious Classes. By T. A. Lloyd, F.R.S., F.G.S. London, 1851. 8vo, pp. 40. Printed for Private Circulation.	
	4. On the Importance of studying Abstract Science with a View to its Future Practical Application: Being an Introductory Lecture at Putney College. By Lyon Playfair, F.R.S., F.C.S. London, 1848. 8vo. Printed for Private Circulation.	
	5. Notes on the Organization of an Industrial College for Artisans. By T. Twining, Jun. In a Letter to Lord Shaftesbury. London, 1851. Printed for Private Circulation.	
	6. Suggestions for a Crystal College or New Palace of Glass for combining the Intellectual Talent of all Nations; or a Sketch of a Practical Philosophy of Education. By W. Cave Thomas. London, 1851, pp. 64.	
	7. How much longer are we to continue teaching nothing more than what was taught two or three centuries ago?	

ART.		Page
	or ought not our highest Education to embrace the whole Range of our Present Knowledge? and ought not the Education of all Classes to have a direct Reference to the Wants of our Free, Busy, and Enlightened Age? By the Rev. Foster Barham Zincke, Vicar of Wherstead. London, 1850, pp. 42.	
8.	Why must we educate the Whole People? and what prevents our doing it? By the Rev. Foster Barham Zincke. London, 1850, pp. 54.	
9.	Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures, fondée en 1829. Paris, pp. 42.	
10.	Report of the Head Master of the Government School of Design at Sheffield on the National Exposition of Manufactures at Paris. (In the Annual Report of the School.) Sheffield, 1849.	
11.	Records of the School of Mines, and of Science applied to the Arts. Vol. i., Part i. Inaugural and Introductory Lectures to the Courses for the Session 1851-52. Published by order of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. London, 1852. 8vo, pp. 148.	
12.	Lectures on the Results of the Great Exhibition of 1851, delivered before the Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, at the suggestion of H.R.H. Prince Albert, President of the Society. London, 1852, pp. 634,	519
IX. 1.	Political Elements, or the Progress of Modern Legislation. By Joseph Moseley, B.C.L. London, 1852.	
2.	On the Method of Observation and Reasoning in Politics. By G. Cornwall Lewis. 2 vols. London, 1852,	559

M10
18



THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

AUGUST, 1852.

ART. I.—*Life of Lord Jeffrey : with a Selection from his Correspondence.* By LORD COCKBURN, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1852.

It was in the winter of 1786-7 that the poet Burns, a new prospect having been suddenly opened up to him by the kind intervention of Blacklock, and a few other influential men in Edinburgh, abandoned his desperate project of emigrating to the West Indies, and hastened to pay his first and memorable visit to the Scottish metropolis. During that winter, as all who are acquainted with his life know, the Ayrshire ploughman, then in his twenty-ninth year, was the lion of Edinburgh society. Lord Monboddo, Dugald Stewart, Harry Erskine, Dr. Robertson, Dr. Hugh Blair, Henry Mackenzie, Dr. Gregory, Dr. Black, Dr. Adam Ferguson—such were the names then most conspicuous in the literary capital of North Britain ; and it was in the company of these men, alternated with that of the Creeches, the Smellies, the Willie Nicols, and other contemporary Edinburgh celebrities of a lower grade, that Burns first realized the fact that he was no mere bard of local note, but a new power and magnate in Scottish literature.

To those who are alive to the poetry of coincidences, two anecdotes connected with this residence of Burns in Edinburgh will always be specially interesting. What reader of Lockhart's *Life of Scott* is there who does not remember the account there given of Scott's first and only interview with Burns? As the story is now more minutely told in Mr. Robert Chambers's *Life of Burns*, Scott, who was then a lad of seventeen, just removed from the High School to a desk in his father's office, was invited by his friend and companion, the son of Dr. Ferguson, to accom-

pany him to *his* father's house on an evening when Burns was to be there. The two youngsters entered the room, sat down unnoticed by their seniors, and looked on and listened in modest silence. Burns, when he came in, seemed a little out of his element, and, instead of mingling at once with the company, kept going about the room, looking at the pictures on the walls. One print particularly arrested his attention. It represented a soldier lying dead among the snow, his dog on one side, and a woman with a child in her arms on the other. Underneath the print were some lines of verse descriptive of the subject, which Burns read aloud with a voice faltering with emotion. A little while after, turning to the company and pointing to the print, he asked if any one could tell him who was the author of the lines. No one chanced to know, excepting Scott, who remembered that they were from an obscure poem of Langhorne's. The information, whispered by Scott to some one near, was repeated to Burns, who, after asking a little more about the matter, rewarded his young informant with a look of kindly interest, and the words, (Sir Adam Ferguson reports them,) "You'll be a man yet, sir." Such is the one story, the story of the "literary ordination," as Mr. Chambers well calls it, of Scott by Burns—a scene which we think Sir William Allan would have delighted to paint. The other story, we believe, is now told for the first time by Lord Cockburn. Somewhere about the very day on which the foregoing incident happened, "a little black creature" of a boy, we are told, who was going up the High Street of Edinburgh, and staring diligently about him, was attracted by the appearance of a man whom he saw standing on the pavement. He was taking a good and leisurely view of the object of his curiosity, when some one standing at a shop-door tapped him on the shoulder, and said, "Ay, laddie, ye may weel look at that man! that's Robert Burns." The "little black creature," thus early addicted to criticism, was Francis Jeffrey, the junior of Scott by four years, and exactly four years behind him in the classes of the High School, where he was known as a clever nervous little fellow, who never lost a place without crying. It is mentioned as a curious fact by Lord Cockburn, that Jeffrey's first teacher at the High School, a Mr. Luke Fraser, had the singular good fortune of sending forth, from three successive classes of four years each, three pupils no less distinguished than Walter Scott, Francis Jeffrey, and Henry Brougham.

It is not for the mere purpose of anecdote that we cite these names and coincidences. We should like very much to make out for Scotland in general as suggestive a series of her intellectual representatives as Lord Cockburn has here made out for part of the pedagogic era of the worthy and long dead Mr.

Luke Fraser. Confining our regards to the eighteenth century, the preceding paragraphs enable us to group together at least three conspicuous Scottish names as belonging, by right of birth, to the third quarter of that century—Burns, born in Ayrshire in 1759; Scott, born in Edinburgh in 1769; and Jeffrey, born in the same place in 1773. Supposing we go a little farther back for some other prominent Scottish names of the same century, the readiest to occur to the memory will be those of James Thomson, the poet, born in Roxburghshire in 1700; Thomas Reid, the philosopher, born near Aberdeen in 1710; David Hume, born at Edinburgh in 1711; Robertson the historian, born in Mid-Lothian in 1721; Tobias Smollett, the novelist, born at Cardross in the same year; Adam Smith, born at Kirkcaldy in 1723; Robert Fergusson, the Scottish poet, born at Edinburgh in 1750; and Dugald Stewart, born at Edinburgh in 1753. And if for a similar purpose, we come down to the last quarter of the century, five names at least will be sure to occur to us, in addition to that of Brougham—Thomas Campbell, born at Glasgow in 1777; Thomas Chalmers, born at Anstruther in Fifeshire in 1780; John Wilson, born, if we may trust our authorities, at Paisley in 1789; Thomas Carlyle, born at Ecclefechan in Dumfries-shire in 1795; and Sir William Hamilton, born at Edinburgh before the close of the century. In this list we omit the distinguished contemporary Scottish names in physical science; we ought not, however, to omit the names of Sir James Mackintosh, born near Inverness in 1765, and James Mill, born at Montrose in 1773. The short life of Burns, if we choose him as the central figure of the group, connects together all these names. The oldest of them was in the prime of life when Burns was born, and the youngest of them had seen the light before Burns died.

On glancing in order along this series of eminent Scotchmen born in the eighteenth century, it will be seen that they may be roughly distributed into two nearly equal classes—men of philosophic intellect, devoted to the work of general speculation, or thought as such; and men of literary or poetic genius, whose works belong more properly to the category of pure literary or artistic effort. In the one class may be ranked Reid, Hume, Adam Smith, Dugald Stewart, Mackintosh, Mill, Chalmers, and Sir William Hamilton; in the other, Thomson, Smollett, Robertson, Fergusson, Burns, Scott, Jeffrey, Campbell, Wilson, Irving, and Carlyle. Do not let us be mistaken. In using the phrases “philosophic intellect” and “literary genius,” to denote the distinction referred to, we do not imply anything of accurate discrimination between the phrases themselves. For aught that we care, the phrases may be reversed, and the men of the one class

may be styled men of philosophic genius, and those of the other, men of literary habit and intellect. If we prefer to follow the popular usage in our application of the terms, it is not with any intention of making out for the one class, by the appropriation to it of the peculiar term "genius," a certificate of a higher kind of excellence than belongs to the other. Even according to the popular acceptance of the term, several of those whom we have included in the literary category—as, for example, Robertson, must be denied the title of men of genius; while, according to no endurable definition of the term, could the title of men of genius be refused to such men as Adam Smith, or Chalmers, or Hamilton. Nor even, when thus explained, will our classification bear any very rigid scrutiny. By a considerable portion of what may be called the fundamental or unapparent half of his genius, Carlyle belongs to the class of speculative thinkers; while, on the other hand, the case of Chalmers is one in which the thinking or speculative faculty, which certainly belonged to him, was surcharged and deluged by such a constant flood from the feelings that, instead of ranking him with the thinkers as above, we might, with equal or greater propriety, transpose him to the other side, or even name him on both sides. His thinking faculty, which was what he himself set most store by, was so beset and begirt by his other and more active dispositions, that instead of working on and on through any resisting medium with iron continuity, it discharged itself almost invariably, as soon as it touched a subject, in large proximate generalizations. On the whole, then, instead of the foregoing classification of eminent Scotchmen into men of speculation and men of general literature, one might adopt as equally serviceable a less formal classification which the common satirical talk respecting Scotchmen will suggest. The hard, cool, logical Scotchman—such is the stereotyped phrase in which Englishmen describe the natives of North Britain. There is a sufficient amount of true perception in the phrase to justify its use; but the appreciation it involves reaches only to the surface. The well-known phrase, *perferendum ingenium Scotorum*, used, Buchanan tells us, centuries ago on the continent to express the idea of the Scottish character then universally current and founded on a large induction of instances, is, in reality, far nearer to the fact. Without maintaining at present that *all* Scotchmen are *perfervid*,—that Scotchmen in general are, as we have seen it ingeniously argued, not cool, calculating, and cautious, but positively rash, fanatical, and tempestuous; it will be enough to refer to the instances which prove at least that *some* Scotchmen have this character. The thing may be expressed thus:—On referring to the actual list of Scotchmen who have attained eminence by their writings

or speeches in this or the last century, two types may be distinguished, in one or the other of which the Scottish mind seems necessarily to cast itself—an intellectual type specifically Scottish, but Scottish only in the sense that it is the type which cultured Scottish minds assume when they devote themselves to the work of specific investigation; and a more popular type, characterizing those Scotchmen who, instead of pursuing the work of specific investigation, follow a career calling forth all the resources of Scottish sentiment. Scotchmen of the first or more recondite and formal type are Reid, Smith, Hume, Mill, Mackintosh, and Hamilton, in all of whom, notwithstanding their differences, we see that tendency towards metaphysical speculation for which the Scottish mind has become celebrated; Scotchmen of the other or popular type, partaking of the metaphysical tendency or not, but drawing their essential inspiration from the sentimental depths of the national character, are Burns, Scott, Chalmers, Irving, and Carlyle. However we may choose to express it, the fact of this two-fold forthgoing of the Scottish mind, either in the scholastic and logical direction marked out by one series of eminent predecessors, or in the popular and literary direction marked out by another series of eminent predecessors, cannot be denied.

After all, however, (for we cannot yet leave this topic,) there is, classify and distinguish as we may, a remarkable degree of homogeneity among Scotchmen. The people of North Britain are more homogeneous—have decidedly a more visible basis of common character—than the people of South Britain. A Scotchman may indeed be almost anything that is possible in this world; he may be a saint or a debauchee, a Christian or a sceptic, a spendthrift or a usurer, a soldier or a statesman, a poet or a statistician, a fool or a man of genius, clear-headed or confused-headed, a Thomas Chalmers or a Joseph Hume, a dry man of mere secular facts, or a man through whose mind there roll for ever the stars and all mysteries. Still, under every possible form of mental combination or activity, there will be found in every Scotchman something distinguishable as his birth-quality or *Scotticism*. And what is this *Scotticism* of Scotchmen—this ineradicable, universally-combinable element or peculiarity, breathed into the Scottish soul by those conditions of nature and of life which inhere in or hover over the area of Scottish earth, and which are repeated in the same precise *ensemble* nowhere else? Comes it from the hills, or the moors, or the mists, or any of those other features of scenery and climate which distinguish bleak and rugged Scotland from green and fertile England? In part, doubtless, from these, as from all else that is Scottish. But there are hills, and moors, and

mists where Scotchmen are not bred ; and it is rather in the long series of the memorable things that have been done on the Scottish hills and moors—the acts which the retrospective eye sees flashing through the old Scottish mists, that one is to seek the origin and explanation of whatever Scotticism is. Now, as compared with England at least, that which has come down to the natives of Scotland as something peculiar, generated by the series of past transactions of which their country has been the scene, is an intense spirit of nationality.

No nation in the world is more factitious than the Scotch—more composite as regards the materials out of which it has been constructed. If in England there have been Britons, Celts, Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans, in Scotland there have been Celts, Britons, Romans, Norwegians, Danes, Anglo-Saxons, and Normans. The only difference of any consequence in this respect probably is, that whereas in England the Celtic element is derived chiefly from the British or Welsh, and the Teutonic element chiefly from the Continental-German source, in Scotland the Gaels have furnished most of the Celtic, and the Scandinavian Germans most of the Teutonic element. Nor, if we regard the agencies that have acted intellectually on the two nations, shall we find Scotland to have been less notably affected from without than England. To mention only one circumstance, the Reformation in Scotland was marked by a much more decided importation of new modes of thinking and new social forms than the Reformation in the sister country. But though quite as factitious, therefore, as the English nation, the Scottish, by reason of its very smallness, for one thing, has always possessed a more intense consciousness of its nationality, and a greater liability to be acted upon throughout its whole substance by a common thought or common feeling. Even as late as the year 1707, the entire population of Scotland did not exceed one million of individuals ; and if, going farther back, we fancy this small nation placed on the frontier of one so much larger, and obliged continually to defend itself against the attacks of so powerful a neighbour, we can have no difficulty in conceiving how, in the smaller nation, the feeling of a central life would be sooner developed and kept more continuously active. The sentiment of nationality is essentially negative ; it is the sentiment of a people which has been taught to recognise its own individuality by incessantly marking the line of exclusion between itself and others. Almost all the great movements of Scotland, as a nation, have accordingly been of a negative character, that is, movements of self-defence—the War of National Independence against the Edwards ; the Non-Episcopal struggle in the reigns of the Charleses ; and even the Non-Intrusion

controversy of later times. The very motto of Scotland, as a nation, is negative—*Nemo me impune lacesset*. It is different with England. There have of course been negative movements in England too, but these have been movements of one faction or part of the English people against another; and the activity of the English nation, as a whole, has consisted, not in preserving its own individuality from external attack, but in fully and genially evolving the various elements which it finds within itself, or in powerful positive exertions of its strength upon what lies outside it.

The first and most natural form of what we have called the Scotticism of Scotchmen, that is, of the peculiarity which differences them from people of other countries, and more expressly from Englishmen, is this *amor patriæ*, this inordinate intensity of national feeling. There are very few Scotchmen who, whatever they may pretend, are devoid of this pride of being Scotchmen. Penetrate to the heart of any Scotchman, even the most Anglified, or the most philosophic that can be found, and there will certainly be found a remnant in it of loving regard for the little land that lies north of the Tweed. And what eminent Scotchman can be named in whose constitution a larger or smaller proportion of the *amor Scotiæ* has not been visible? In some of the foremost of such men, as Burns, Scott, and Wilson, this *amor Scotiæ* has even been present as a confessed ingredient of their genius,—a sentiment determining, to a great extent, the style and matter of all that they have written or attempted.

“The rough bur-thistle spreading wide
 Among the bearded bear,—
 I turn’d the weeding-heuk aside,
 And spared the symbol dear.
 No nation, no station
 My envy e’er could raise—
 A Scot still, but blot still,
 I knew nae higher praise.”

In reading the writings of such men, one is perpetually reminded, in the most direct manner, that these writings are to be regarded as belonging to a strictly national literature.* But even in those Scotchmen in the determination of whose intellectual efforts the *amor Scotiæ* has acted no such obvious and ostensible part, the presence of some mental reference to, or intermittent communication of sentiment with, the land of their birth, is almost sure to be detected. The speculations of Reid and Hume and Adam Smith, and, in some degree, also, those of Chalmers, were in subjects interesting not to Scotchmen alone, but to the human race as such; and yet, precisely as these men enunciated their generalities intended for the whole world in

good broad Scotch, so had they all, after their different ways, a genuine Scottish relish for Scottish humours, jokes, and antiquities. The same thing is true of Carlyle, a power as he is recognised to be not in Scottish only, but in all British literature. Even James Mill, who, more than most Scotchmen, succeeded in conforming, both in speech and in writing, to English habits and requirements, relapsed into a Scotchman when he listened to a Scottish song, or told a Scottish anecdote. But perhaps the most interesting example of the appearance of an intense *amor Scotiæ*, where, from the nature of the case, it could have been least expected, is afforded by the writings of Sir William Hamilton. If there is a man now alive conspicuous among his contemporaries for the exercise on the most magnificent scale of an intellect the most pure and abstract, that man is Sir William; and yet, not even when discussing the philosophy of the unconditioned or perfecting the theory of syllogism which is universal, does Sir William forget his Scottish lineage. With what glee, in his notes, or in stray passages in his dissertations themselves, does he seize every opportunity of adding to the proofs that speculation in general has been largely affected by the stream of specific Scottish thought—quoting, for example, the saying of Scaliger, “*Les Ecossois sont bons Philosophes* ;” or dwelling on the fact that at one time almost every continental university had a Scottish professorship of philosophy, specially so named; or reviving the memories of defunct Balfours, and Duncans, and Chalmerses, and Dalgarnos, and other “*Scoti extra Scotiam agentes*” of other centuries; or startling his readers with such genealogical facts as that Immanuel Kant and Sir Isaac Newton had Scottish grandfathers, and that the celebrated French metaphysician Destutt Tracy was, in reality, but a transmogrified Scotchman of the name of Stott! We know nothing more refreshing than such evidences of strong national feeling in such a man. It is the Scottish Stagirite not ashamed of the bonnet and plaid; it is the philosopher in whose veins flows the blood of a Covenanter.

Even now, when Scotchmen, their native country having been so long merged in the higher unity of Great Britain, labour altogether in the interest of this higher unity, and forget or set aside the smaller, they are still liable to be affected characteristically in all that they do by the consciousness that they are Scotchmen. This will be found true whether we regard those Scotchmen who work side by side with Englishmen in the conduct of British public affairs or British commerce, or those Scotchmen who vie with Englishmen in the walks of British authorship and literature. In either case the Scotchman is distinguished from the Englishman by this, that he carries the

consciousness of his nationality about with him. Were he, indeed, disposed to forget it, the banter on the subject to which he is perpetually exposed in the society of his English friends and acquaintances, would serve to keep him in mind of it. It is the same now with the individual Scotchman cast among Englishmen as it was with the Scottish nation when it had to defend its frontier against the English armies. He is in the position of a smaller body placed in contact with a larger one, and rendered more intensely conscious of his individuality by the constant necessity of asserting it. But this self-assertion of a Scotchman among Englishmen, this constant feeling "I am a Scotchman," rests, like the feeling of nationality itself, on a prior assertion of what is in fact a negative. For a Scotchman to be always thinking "I am a Scotchman," is, in the circumstances now under view, tantamount to always thinking "I am *not* an Englishman." The Englishman, on the other hand, has no corresponding feeling. As a member of the large body, whose corporate activity has always, from the very circumstance of its being the larger, been positive rather than negative, the Englishman simply acts out harmoniously his English instincts and tendencies, the feeling of not being a Scotchman, never (except in the case of a stray Englishman located in Scotland) either spontaneously remaining in his mind, or being roused in it by banter. The Scotchman, in short, who works in the general field of British activity, has his thoughts conditioned to some extent at least by the negative of not being an Englishman; the Englishman thinks under no such limitation.

And this leads us to a definition more essential and intimate of the peculiarity of Scottish as compared with English thought. The rudest and most natural form of what we have called the Scotticism of Scotchmen, consists, we have hitherto been saying, in simple consciousness of nationality, simple *amor Scotiæ*, or, under mere restricted circumstances, the simple feeling of not being an Englishman. There are some Scotchmen, however, in whom this first and most natural form of Scotticism is not very well pronounced, and who are either emancipated from it, or think that they are. We know not a few Scottish minds who have really succeeded in transferring their enthusiastic regards from Scotland as such to the higher unity of Great Britain—men, who, sometimes speaking in their own Scottish accent, sometimes in an accent almost purely English, find the objects of their solicitude and admiration, not in the land lying north of the Tweed, but rather in England—its rich green parks and fields, its broad ecclesiastical hierarchy, its noble halls of learning, its majestic and varied literature, the full and generous character of its manly people. We know Scotchmen whose

sentiment is more deeply stirred by Shakespeare's famous apostrophe to "this England," than by Scott's to the land of brown heath and shaggy wood. And as Scotland and England are incorporated, such men are and must be on the increase. But even they shall not escape. If their native quality of Scotticism does not survive in them in the more palpable and open form of mere national feeling, mere *amor Scotiæ*, it survives, nevertheless, in an intellectual habit, having the same root, and as indestructible. And what is this habit? The popular charges of dogmatism, opinionativeness, pugnacity, and the like, brought against Scotchmen by Englishmen, are so many approximations to a definition of it. For our part, we should say that the special habit or peculiarity which distinguishes the intellectual manifestations of Scotchmen—that, in short, in which the Scotticism of Scotchmen most intimately consists,—is the habit of *emphasis*. All Scotchmen are emphatic. ••If a Scotchman is a fool, he gives such emphasis to the nonsense he utters as to be infinitely more insufferable than a fool of any other country; if a Scotchman is a man of genius, he gives such emphasis to the good things he has to communicate, that they have a supremely good chance of being at once or very soon attended to. This habit of emphasis, we believe, is exactly that *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum* which used to be remarked some centuries ago, wherever Scotchmen were known. But emphasis is perhaps a better word than fervour. Many Scotchmen are fervid too, but not all; but all, absolutely all, are emphatic. No one will call Joseph Hume a fervid man, but he is certainly emphatic. And so with David Hume, or Reid, or Adam Smith, or any of those colder-natured Scotchmen of whom we have spoken; fervour cannot be predicated of them, but they had plenty of emphasis. In men like Burns, or Chalmers, or Irving, on the other hand, there was both emphasis and fervour; so also with Carlyle; and so, under a still more curious combination, with Sir William Hamilton. And as we distinguish emphasis from fervour, so would we distinguish it from perseverance. Scotchmen are said to be persevering, but the saying is not universally true; Scotchmen are or are not morally persevering, but all Scotchmen are intellectually emphatic. Emphasis, we repeat, intellectual emphasis—the habit of laying stress on certain things rather than co-ordinating all—in this consists what is essential in the Scotticism of Scotchmen. And, as this observation is empirically verified by the very manner in which Scotchmen enunciate their words in ordinary talk, so it might be deduced scientifically from what we have already said regarding the nature and effects of the feeling of nationality. The habit of *thinking emphatically* is a necessary result of thinking

much in the presence of, and in resistance to, a negative; it is the habit of a people that has been accustomed to act on the defensive, rather than of a people peacefully self-evolved and accustomed to act positively; it is the habit of Protestantism rather than of Catholicism, of Presbyterianism rather than of Episcopacy, of Dissent rather than of Conformity.

The greatest effects which the Scottish mind has yet produced on the world—and these effects, by the confession of Englishmen themselves, have not been small—have been the results, in part at least, of this national habit of emphasis. Until towards the close of last century, the special department of labour in which Scotchmen had, to any great extent, exerted themselves so as to make a figure in the general intellectual world, was the department of Philosophy—Metaphysical and Dialectic. Their triumphs in this department are historical. What is called the Scottish Philosophy, constitutes, in the eyes of all who know anything of history, a most important stage in the intellectual evolution of modern times. From the time of those old Duncans, and Balfours, and Dalgarnos, mentioned by Sir William Hamilton, who discoursed on philosophy, and wrote dialectical treatises in Latin in all the cities of the Continent, down to our own days, we can point to a succession of Scottish thinkers in whom the interest in metaphysical studies was kept alive, and by whose labours new contributions to mental science were continually being made. It was by the Scottish mind, in fact, that the modern philosophy was conducted to that point where Kant and the Germans took it up. The qualifications of the Scottish mind for this task were, doubtless, various. Perhaps there was something in that special combination of the Celtic and the Scandinavian out of which the Scottish nation, for the most part, took its rise, to produce an aptitude for dialectical exercises. Nay, farther, it would not be altogether fanciful to suppose that those very national struggles of the Scotch in the course of which they acquired so strong a sense of their national individuality, that is, of the distinction between all that was Scotch and all that was not Scotch, served, in a rough way, to facilitate to all Scotchmen that fundamental idea of the distinction between the *Ego* and the *Non-Ego*, the clear and rigorous apprehension of which is the first step in philosophy, and the one test of the philosopher. But, in a still more important degree, we hold the success of the Scottish mind in philosophy to have been the result of the national habit of intellectual emphasis. A Scotchman, when he thinks, cannot, so easily and comfortably as the Englishman, repose on an upper level of propositions co-ordinated for him by tradition, sweet feeling, and pleasant circumstance; that necessity of his nature

which leads him to emphasise certain things rather than to take all things together in their established co-ordination, drives him down and still down in search of certain generalities whereon he may see that all can be built. It was this habit of emphasis, this inability to rest on the level of sweetly-composed experience, that led Hume to scepticism; it was the same habit, the same inability, conjoined, however, with more of faith and reverence, that led Reid to lay down in the chasm of Hume's scepticism certain blocks of ultimate propositions or principles, capable of being individually enumerated, and yet, as he thought, forming a sufficient basement for all that men think or believe. And the same tendency is visible among Scotchmen now. It amazes Scotchmen to see on what proximate propositions even Englishmen who are celebrated as thinkers can rest, and how little the best of them, such as Whewell, Maurice, Hare, Henry Taylor, and some others, seem to feel the necessity of persisting towards first principles. The essays of Henry Taylor and of Arthur Helps are, in this respect, most characteristically English. As writings, they are most sweet, solid, and soothing; and yet there is many a Scotchman with not half the intellect of either of the writers, to whom, by reason of his native tendency to seek for the emphatic, they would appear almost shallow. So also with that much praised old English book, Browne's *Religio Medici*, and with many other old English prose writings. The truth is that, if Scotchmen have, so far, a source of superiority over Englishmen in their habit of dwelling only on the emphatic, they have also in this same habit a source of inferiority. Quietism, mysticism, that soft meditative disposition which takes things for granted in the co-ordination established by mere life and usage, pouring into the confusion thus externally given the rich oil of an abounding inner joy, interpenetrating all and harmonizing all—these are, for the most part, alien to the Scotchman. No, his walk, as a thinker, is not by the meadows, and the wheat-fields, and the green lanes, and the ivy-clad parish churches, where all is gentle, and antique, and fertile, but by the bleak sea-shore which parts the certain from the limitless, where there is doubt in the sea-mew's shriek, and where it is well if, in the advancing tide, he can find footing on a rock among the tangle! But this very tendency of his towards what is intellectually extreme, injures his sense of proportion in what is concrete and actual; and hence it is that when he leaves the field of abstract thought, and betakes himself to creative literature, he produces nothing comparable in fulness, wealth, and harmoniousness to the imaginations of a Chaucer or a Shakespeare. The highest genius, indeed, involves also the capability of the intellectual extreme; and, accordingly, in the writings of

those great Englishmen, as well as in those of the living English poet Tennyson, there are strokes in abundance of that pure intellectual emphasis in which the Scotchman delights; but then there is also with them such a genial acceptance of all things, great or small, in their established co-ordination, that the flashes of emphasis are as if they came not from a battle done on an open moor, but from a battle transacting itself in the depths of a forest. Among Scottish thinkers, Mackintosh is the one that approaches nearest to the English model, a circumstance which may be accounted for by the fact that much of what he did consisted, from the necessities of the object-matter of his speculations, in judicious compromise.

But even in the field of literature* we will not abandon the Scotchman. His habit of emphasis has here enabled him to do good service too. His entry on this field, however, was later than his entry on the field of philosophy. True, there had been, contemporary with the Scottish philosophers, or even anterior to them, Scottish poets and general prose writers of note — Dunbar, Gawin Douglas, King James, Buchanan, Sir David Lindsay, Henderson, Sir George Mackenzie, Allan Ramsay, and the like. True, also, in those snatches of popular ballad and song which came down from generation to generation in Scotland, many of them written by no one knew who, and almost all of them overflowing with either humour or melancholy, there was at once a fountain and a promise of an exquisite national literature. We could think of old Nicol Burn, the violer, till our eyes filled with tears.

“ But minstrel Burn cannot assuage

His woes while time endureth,

To see the changes of this age

Which fleeting time procureth.

Full many a place stands in hard case

Where joy was wont beforrow,

With Humes that dwelt on Leader side,

And Scotts that dwelt on Yarrow.”

There was literature in the times when such old strains were sung. But the true avatar of the Scottish mind in modern literature, came later than the manifestation of the same mind in Philosophy. Were we to fix a precise date for it, we should name the period of Burns's first visit to Edinburgh, and familiar meetings with the men of literary talent and distinction then assembled there. Edinburgh was, indeed, even then a literary capital, boasting of its Monboddos, and Stewarts, and Robertsons, and Blairs, and Mackenzies, and Gregories—men who had already begun the race of literary rivalry with their contemporaries south of the Tweed. But, so far as the literary excel-

lence of these men did not depend on their participation in that tendency to abstract thinking, which had already produced its special fruit in the Scottish Philosophy, it consisted in little more than a reflection or imitation of what was already common and acknowledged in the prior or contemporary literature of South Britain. To write essays such as those of the *Spectator*; to be master of a style which Englishmen should pronounce pure, and to produce compositions in that style worthy of being ranked with the compositions of English authors—such was the aim and aspiration of Edinburgh literati, between whom and their London cousins there was all the difference that there is between the latitude of Edinburgh and the latitude of London, between the daily use of the broad Scotch dialect, and the daily use of the classic English. For Scotland this mere imitation of English models was but a poor and unsatisfactory vein of literary enterprise. What was necessary was the appearance of some man of genius who should flash through all that, and who, by the application to literature, or the art of universal expression, of that same Scottish habit of emphasis which had already produced such striking and original results in philosophy, should teach the Scottish nation its true power in literature, and shew a first example of it. Such a man was Burns. He it was who, uniting emotional fervour with intellectual emphasis, and drawing his inspiration from all those depths of sentiment in the Scottish people which his predecessors, the philosophers, had hardly so much as touched, struck for the first time a new chord, and revealed for the first time what a Scottish writer could do by trusting to the whole wealth of Scottish resources. And from the time of Burns, accordingly, there has been a series of eminent literary Scotchmen quite different from that series of hard logical Scotchmen who had till then been the most conspicuous representatives of their country in the eyes of the reading public of Great Britain—a series of Scotchmen displaying to the world the power of emphatic sentiment and emphatic expression as strikingly as their predecessors had displayed the power of emphatic reasoning. While the old philosophic energy of Scotland still remained unexhausted, the honours of Reid and Hume and Smith and Stewart passing on to such men as Brown and Mill and Mackintosh and Hamilton (in favour of the last of whom even Germany has resigned her philosophic interregnum), the specially literary energy which had been awakened in the country descended along another line in the persons of Scott, and Jeffrey, and Chalmers, and Campbell, and Wilson, and Carlyle. Considering the amount of influence exerted by such men upon the whole spirit and substance of British literature,—considering how disproportionate a share of the whole literary produce of Great

Britain in the nineteenth century has come either from them or from other Scotchmen,—and considering what a stamp of peculiarity marks all that portion of this produce which is of Scottish origin, it does not seem too much to say, that the rise and growth of Scottish Literature is as notable a historical phenomenon as the rise and growth of the Scottish Philosophy. And considering, moreover, how lately Scotland has entered on this literary field, how little time she has had to display her powers, how recently she was in this respect savage, and how much of her savage vitality yet remains to be articulated in civilized books, may we not hope that her literary avatar is but beginning, and has a goodly course yet to run? From the Solway to Caithness we hear a loud Amen!

In thus connecting the name and the memory of Jeffrey with the history of the internal intellectual development and the external intellectual action of his native land, we have done a thing which he himself would have been the last to repudiate, and which, whether he would have repudiated it or not, is natural, just, and becoming. Everything is as it is possible for it to be; and that the new era of British criticism was inaugurated by a Scotchman is a proof that a Scotchman was the man to inaugurate it. What, then, was Jeffrey among Scotchmen, and what were the talents and circumstances that fitted him for his task?

The Life of Jeffrey by Lord Cockburn is a work of very great merit, intrinsically worth a hundred of such lives of distinguished men as are daily proceeding from the press. It is not, indeed, an artistic biography; it does not shape and mould the character of Jeffrey by a succession of descriptive touches, and deposit it finally as a finished conception of the man in the minds of distant readers; it contains no elaborate or subtle appreciation of Jeffrey's more intimate views and feelings, or of his place and function in the literary movement of his time. But the writer knew and loved his subject, and it was not for the purpose of making a book that he wrote his life. He had known him in youth, he had known him in old age; he had been his friend and daily companion;—not a sentence, therefore, did he write, but the lineaments of the dead were before him, and the old familiar tones were present to his ear. It would be a miracle, then, if he had written untruly, and if some image of the man as he really was were not placed before the reader. Add to this, that the successive events of Jeffrey's life are duly recorded and explained; and that the appended selection from his letters is at once ample and judicious. In one portion of the Life, too, Lord Cockburn, as was to be expected, has

Uttarpara Jashirana Public Library

Acqn No. 5464, Date 28.12.74

052 NOR
V.M 17 1010

acquitted himself in a manner quite masterly. This is where he describes the condition of Scotland in general, and of society in Edinburgh in particular, at the time when Jeffrey entered upon public and literary life. Nothing could be better than the sketches given of the state of Scottish politics at that period, and of the more prominent personages who were then connected with the Scottish Bar, or otherwise invested with importance in the public opinion of the country. Macaulay could have done this part of the book with finer literary art, but not with more clear and thorough insight. One is glad to see that, notwithstanding a certain tendency to euphuism, as if Lord Cockburn had throughout the book laid a restraint on the well-known vigour of his Scottish sense and humour, lest by indulging it he should Scotticize Jeffrey too much, the Scotchman nevertheless breaks through sufficiently to remind all who know the author by repute, that a man more thoroughly Scotch at heart is not now known to the purlieus of the Parliament House, or familiar to the citizens of the New Town of Edinburgh. With Lord Cockburn for our guide, therefore, let us view Jeffrey for a little longer against his native background of Scottish manners and Scottish associations.

From his very boyhood, Jeffrey belonged to a rather peculiar type of the Scottish *physique* and character. The son of a genuine citizen of Edinburgh, attached as a clerk to its law courts, and described as a sensible, plodding, and somewhat morose man, Jeffrey, even at the Iligh School, was noted as a sharp, nervous, swarthy little fellow, of a type and physiognomy different from that of the majority of Scottish boys. Walter Scott, though at first a sickly and lame scholar, almost always absent from the classes, grew up a stalwart fair-haired youth, capable of taking part in a row in the pit of a theatre, or in any other freak that required bone and sinew; Jeffrey, with plenty of spirit and alacrity, remained always sharp, incisive, and diminutive. Transferred at the age of fourteen to Glasgow College, where he received the better part of his academic training, and where he was one of the most distinguished pupils of one of the best professors that ever taught in a Scotch University—John Jardine, Professor of Logic—he became known there to his heavier class-fellows, as an extremely quick, fluent, petulant youth, unmercifully severe in his criticisms on the essays of other students; not very sparing in his comments even on the professors; and who, in spite of raillery and the Glasgow decorum of those days, persisted in the whim of cherishing a very black moustache, covering the whole of his upper lip. Even at this time he was a great reader, a rapid writer for his own amusement, and a favourite speaker in the College Clubs and Societies.

After two years at Glasgow, he returned to Edinburgh, where he spent two years more, partly in attending the law-classes at the University, partly in miscellaneous literary occupations prescribed by himself. The quantity of manuscript, in the form of essays, translations, orations, and even poems, produced by him at this period, or between his sixteenth and nineteenth year, was, as we learn from his biographer, something quite extraordinary; and it is curious to remark in the extracts which are given from some of these productions, the early and decided tendency of Jeffrey's mind to literary criticism. Almost all his own essays, it appears, had appended to them a paragraph or two of self-criticism,—generally a very slashing review of their merits and demerits on a retrospective perusal of them; and one manuscript of seventy folio pages is devoted to an elaborate analysis of his own character. A sample of Jeffrey at seventeen reviewing himself may not be uninteresting. The following is from a criticism appended to a collection of thirty essays:—

“It was, I thought, and so far I surely did think justly, a very essential point for a young man to acquire the habit of expressing himself with ease upon subjects which he is unavoidably one time or another to talk of. This, to be sure, might perhaps have been attained, in a degree adequate to all common occasions, without being at the trouble to write down all that I said, or might have said, on them; and as the habit of writing and speaking are not reciprocal, the plan of accustoming myself to speak a great deal upon them may perhaps appear better calculated for this purpose. But besides that I thus avoid many inaccuracies, and, as I am in Scotland, many improprieties, I can spare auditors from the fatigue of being the tools and vehicles of my experiment, and save myself from the reputation of talkativeness and folly. But though the habit of speaking easily be a very valuable one, that of thinking correctly is undoubtedly much more so. This, too, cannot be attained by mere mechanical practice, and an earlier exertion of those powers, with which every one is endued, is absolutely necessary to confirm it. The human mind, at least mine, which is all I have to do with, is such a chaotic confused business, such a jumble and hurry of ideas, that it is absolutely impossible to follow the train and extent of our ideas upon any one topic, without more exertion than the conception of them required. To remedy this, and to fix the bounds of our knowledge and belief on any subject, there is no way but to write down, deliberately and patiently, the notions which first naturally present themselves on that point; or, if we refuse any, taking care it be such as have assumed a place in our minds merely from the influence of education or prejudice, and not those which the hand of reason has planted, and which have been nurtured by the habit of reflection. . . . The only other object I had in view was, perhaps not the least important of the whole, to attempt an imitation of the style and manner of the principal persons who have exhibited their abilities in periodical and

short essays. Dr. Johnson, Addison, Mackenzie, and Steele, are the only personages I have attempted to ape, and these it would be absurd in me to cope with. I have at least this consolation, that my emulation can be called by no means little. Of these essays I have little more to say. I have, in truth, said perhaps already more than they deserve."—*Life*, pp. 30-33. .

Here, for a youth of seventeen, we have certainly industry, ambition, a swift, sharp audacity of opinion, and a wonderful fluency of words. That much envied faculty, usually called "command of language," Jeffrey, if we may judge from this and similar specimens, certainly had from the first. In fact, it is not treating the thing too seriously to note, in connexion with such a specimen, the early appearance of what was all along Jeffrey's defect. We have spoken of emphasis as most specifically the quality of the Scottish mind; and we have described as the proper manifestation of this emphasis in the direction of *thought*, that resolute striving after first principles, that tendency to rest only on distinct and massive generalities, which has been conspicuously exhibited in the works of the Scottish thinkers. Now in this kind of emphasis, or at least in emphasis leading to this result, Jeffrey was certainly deficient. Nimble leaping from point to point, from commonplace to something better, and from something better back to commonplace, but always with a distinct and characteristic meaning in the end; a hawk-like ease of motion, and keenness of vision in the atmosphere of what may be called the proximate notions of educated men—this, rather than a sluggish attachment to certain propositions or maxims emphasised once for all, or than a tendency, in every individual case of intellectual exertion, to push through the object-matter, and carry all on to the terminus of some new proposition that *might* be emphasised and clung to, was the mental peculiarity of Jeffrey. As soon as he began to write, his acute mind darted along from conception to conception, seizing points of real truth and consequence, and insinuating itself with great delicacy into the longest and most winding intricacies; words, too, flowed in abundance, most apt for the expression of his meaning; but instead of stemming the words as they came, and damming them back, as it were by a mental resolve, till by their very accumulation and pressure the meaning to be finally expressed became deep and weighty, he suffered himself to be carried along in their flow, not completing the thought first, but thinking as he swam. This "command of language," indeed, so soon conspicuous in Jeffrey, is not an unfrequent sign of promising talent in early life; but we have generally found it give way, with men of real ability, before youth was over, under the influence of a newly-awakened tendency towards

the deep and precise in thought. Nor can we help thinking that, had anything occurred, during Jeffrey's youth, to arrest his native fluency, and to arouse him to the value of that kind of mental effort which seeks for ultimate propositions, and spends itself in framing them, even he would have turned out a more weighty and thoroughgoing writer, after the peculiar Scottish type. But, probably, Jardine's class rather stimulated than repressed his native tendency in this respect; and of neither of the two men who in that day were the best academic representatives of the claims of matter as distinct from those of style—Miller of Glasgow, and Dugald Stewart of Edinburgh—was Jeffrey ever the pupil. What of the Scottish tendency to emphatic thought, therefore, Jeffrey possessed—and much of it he did possess—was revealed not so much in a recurrence to, or a gravitation towards, deep formal propositions on various subjects, as in a general salience he always contrived to give to what he accounted important, a kind of sharp decisive ring of the voice on what *he* believed and *you* might doubt. On the whole, he had far more of the Scottish tendency to thought as such than Scott, in whom the national turn for emphasis spent itself entirely in sentiment and descriptive expression, and who, as the very form of his head indicated, abode contentedly all his life among the popular sagacities, and eschewed all movement towards the intellectually extreme.

A brief residence by Jeffrey in Oxford in 1791-2, always remembered by him as a time of insupportable loneliness and ennui, had at least one effect upon him which, like his moustache at Glasgow, exposed him to the raillery of his Scottish friends. “Jeffrey,” Lord Holland afterwards said, “had lost the broad Scotch at Oxford, but he had gained only the narrow English.” No one, indeed, could hear Jeffrey in after life without noting, as something peculiar, his sharp, petulant, high-keyed manner of pronouncing his words, so different from either the broad full sing-song of a genuine Scottish speaker, or the firm and manly speech of an educated Englishman. The change was a bold one for a Scottish youth of that day. As late as fifteen years ago, in most parts of Scotland, a schoolboy that should have presumed to talk English, except on stated occasions within school, or that even then should have exhibited too sedulous a study of the vowel-sounds in Walker's Dictionary, would have been treated as a daw with borrowed feathers, and unmercifully plucked. In Jeffrey's case, however, the little affectation, if such it was, which led him to pick up the English accent, was something pleasantly characteristic. He never really ceased to be a Scotchman. Till his dying day, the *amor patriæ* was conspicuously strong in him, and he never lost his relish for Scottish

humours and Scottish phraseology. He could talk Scotch when he liked, Lord Cockburn says, "as correctly as when the Doric of the Edinburgh Lawnmarket had been only improved in him by that of the Glasgow Rottenrow;" and we have it on undoubted authority that when, among his familiar friends, he took to telling his reminiscences of old Braxy and other notabilities of the Scottish Bench and Bar, no one could beat him as a mimic, and not even Scott could convey a Scotticism better.

Between Jeffrey's return from Oxford and his entry on professional life as a Scottish barrister, there intervened a period of two years, spent in law-studies, in agreeable intercourse with his friends; in brilliant speech-making at the weekly meetings of the famous Speculative Club, then and long afterwards the training school of young celebrities native to Edinburgh, or sent thither from England to attend the University; and in the gratification of his literary propensity by the increase of his private stock of manuscripts on all sorts of subjects. He had serious thoughts, it appears, at one time of trying to become a poet. So convinced, however, is his biographer that this was a hallucination, that, with bundles of Jeffrey's early poetical efforts before him, he has not given us a single specimen. In the extracts given from the prose writings of the same period we recognise, in somewhat more matured combination, the same qualities that were discernible in the earlier productions—extreme fluency in tasteful expression; an intellect, swift, keen, and glancing, rather than deep or heavy; a cutting, unhesitating declaration of opinion *for* this or *against* that at a moment's notice; and a decided tendency to the practice of criticism.

It was with all these qualities developed in him in a degree that rendered him notable among the young men who knew him, and with an amount of general culture and knowledge such as was possessed by few of them, that Jeffrey, in the winter of 1794, assumed the gown and wig of a Scottish barrister. It is at this epoch in his life that he may be regarded as having first ceased to be a mere reader and student, and as having come into a position of practical relationship to Scottish polity, and the whole circle of Scottish interests. The population of Scotland may have then amounted to about a million and a half; Edinburgh was the centre of all the political activity of this small population; the lawyers of Edinburgh were its social aristocracy; and Jeffrey, as a young member of this aristocracy, had a more decided part to choose, and a more active future in prospect, than if he had been a mere ordinary citizen. We cannot better introduce the reader to an acquaintance with Jeffrey in this aspect than by quoting from Lord Cockburn's

admirable delineation of the state of Scottish society towards the end of the last and the beginning of the present century.

"Everything was inflamed by the first French Revolution. Even in England all ordinary faction was absorbed by the two parties—of those who thought that that terrible example, by shewing the dangers of wrongs too long maintained, was the strongest reason for the timely correction of our own defects; and of those who considered this opinion as a revolutionary device, and held that the atrocities in France were conclusive against our exciting sympathetic hopes by any admission that curable defect existed. . . . Never, since our own Revolution, was there a period when public life was so exasperated by hatred, or the charities of private life were so soured by political aversion.

"If this was the condition of England, with its larger population, its free institutions, its diffused wealth, and its old habits of public discussion, a few facts will account for the condition of Scotland. There was then in this country no popular representation, no emancipated burghs, no effective rival of the Established Church, no independent press, no free public meetings, and no better trial by jury, even in political cases, (except high treason,) than was consistent with the circumstances, that the jurors were not sent into Court under any impartial rule, and that, when in Court, those who were to try the case were named by the presiding judge. The Scotch representatives were only forty-five; of whom thirty were elected for counties, and fifteen for towns. Both from its price and its nature (being enveloped in feudal and technical absurdities) the elective franchise in counties, where alone it existed, was far above the reach of the whole lower, and of a great majority of the middle, and of many even of the higher ranks. There were probably not above 1500 or 2000 county electors in all Scotland; a body not too large to be held, hope included, in Government's hand. The return, therefore, of a single opposition member was never to be expected. . . . Of the fifteen town members, Edinburgh returned one. The other fourteen were produced by clusters of four or five unconnected burghs electing each one delegate, and these four or five delegates electing the representative. Whatever this system may have been originally, it had grown, in reference to the people, into as complete a mockery as if it had been invented for their degradation. The people had nothing to do with it. It was all managed by Town-Councils, of never more than thirty-three members; and every Town-Council was self-elected, and consequently perpetuated its own interests. The election of either the town or the county member was a matter of such utter indifference to the people, that they often only knew of it by the ringing of a bell, or by seeing it mentioned next day in a newspaper; for the farce was generally performed in an apartment from which, if convenient, the public could be excluded. . . . Scotland did not maintain a single opposition newspaper, or magazine, or periodical publication. . . . Meetings of the adhe-

rents of Government for party purposes, and for such things as victories and charities, were common enough. But, with ample materials for opposition meetings, they were in total disuse. I doubt if there was one held in Edinburgh between the year 1795 and the year 1820. Attendance was understood to be fatal. The very banks were overawed, and conferred their favours with a very different hand to the adherents of the two parties. . . . Thus, politically, Scotland was dead. It was not unlike a village at a great man's gate. Without a single free institution or habit, opposition was rebellion, submission probable success.

"If there had been any hope of ministerial change, or even any relief by variety of ministerial organs, the completeness of the Scotch subjugation might have been less. But the whole country was managed by the undisputed and sagacious energy of a single native, who knew the circumstances, and the wants,* and the proper bait, of every countryman worth being attended to. Henry Dundas, the first Lord Melville, was the Pharos of Scotland. Who steered upon him was safe; who disregarded his light was wrecked. It was to his nod that every man owed what he got, and looked for what he wished. Always at the head of some great department of the public service, and with the indirect command of places in every other department; and the establishments of Scotland, instead of being pruned, multiplying—the judges, the sheriffs, the clergy, the professors, the town-councillors, the members of parliament and of every public board, including all the officers of the revenue, and shoals of commissions in the military, the naval, and the Indian service, were all the breath of his nostril. This despotism was greatly strengthened by the personal character and manners of the man. Handsome, gentlemanlike, frank, cheerful, and social, he was a favourite with most men, and with all women. Too much a man of the world not to live well with his opponents when they would let him, and totally incapable of personal harshness or unkindness, it was not unnatural that his official favours should be confined to his own innumerable and insatiable partisans. With such means so dispensed, no wonder that the monarchy was absolute. . . . To be at the head of such a system was a tempting and corrupting position for a weak, a selfish, or a tyrannical man. But it enabled a man with a head and a temper like Dundas's to be absolute without making his subjects fancy that they ought to be offended. He was the very man for Scotland at that time, and is a Scotchman of whom his country may be proud. Skilful in Parliament, wise and liberal in Council, and with an almost unrivalled power of administration, the usual reproach of his Scotch management is removed by the two facts—that he did not *make* the bad elements he had to work with, and that he did not *abuse* them; which last is the greatest praise that his situation admits of.

* "In addition to common political hostility, this state of things produced great personal bitterness. The insolence, or at least the confidence, of secure power on the one side, and the indignation of bad usage on the other, put the weaker party, and seemed to justify it,

under a tacit proscription. It both excluded those of one class from all public trust, which is not uncommon, and obstructed their attempts to raise themselves anyhow. To an extent now scarcely credible, and curious to think of, it closed the doors and the hearts of friends against friends. There was no place where it operated so severely as at the Bar. . . . These facts enable us to appreciate the virtuous courage of those who really sought for the truth, and, having found it as they thought, openly espoused it. . . . The shires, with only a few individual exceptions, were soulless. But, in all towns, there were some thinking, independent men. Trade and manufactures were rising; the municipal population was increasing; the French Revolution, with its excitement and discussion of principles, was exciting many minds. The great question of Burgh Reform, demonstrably clear in itself, but then denounced as revolutionary, had begun that deep and just feeling of discontent, which operated so beneficially on the public spirit of the citizens all over Scotland for the next forty years. •The people were silent from prudence. A first conviction of simple sedition by a judge-named jury was followed by transportation for fourteen years. They, therefore, left their principles to the defence of the leading Whigs; who, without any special commission, had the moral authority that belongs to honesty and fearlessness. These were chiefly lawyers, whose powers and habits connected them with public affairs;—a bold and united band, without whose steadiness the very idea of independence would, for the day, have been extinguished in Scotland.”—*Life*, pp. 73-81.

To this small but devoted phalanx of Scottish Whigs Jeffrey from the first attached himself. Scott, as was more natural to a man of his predilections, took the other or Tory side. It is a sad thing, if one looks at the matter with any very serious attention, that good men in this world should be obliged thus to take sides at all, or at least to enrol themselves once for all under any one or any other ready-made denomination. One could wish that it were permitted to a man simply to look about for the good things he would like to see done, and to lend his help in time and season to the doing of them, never puzzling his head whether it was Whiggism to do this, or Toryism to do that, or whether the thing to be done had a name at all, provided it were clearly something reasonable in his private view of it. One could wish that what Burns, who still, however, called himself a Whig, once said of his politics, namely, that “he had a few first principles which he would not easily part with, but that, as to all the etiquette, &c., of the thing, he would not have a dissocial word about it with any of God’s creatures,” could be allowed to pass universally as confession of faith enough in political matters. But unfortunately this is impossible. Old port gathers bees-wing—the more bees-wing, they say, the better the wine; and so, in all societies that have lasted some time there float about

traditional maxims and distinctions which one could wish away, were one not assured that they are signs of body and vigour in the very medium they perplex. And, certainly, after Lord Cockburn's description of what Scottish Whiggism forty years ago was, and what it promised to be the exodus out of, one cannot but think that the most unsectarian man ever born into the world might, with perfect safety to his intellectual independence, have been a Scottish Whig. And yet such a source of virtue is there in the antique; so natural is it for strong and genial minds to acquiesce in the conditions that actually exist, unless these are so bad as to outrage the most vital human requirements; such reciprocal kindness is there between a healthy tree and the soil where it has grown, that it may be doubted whether even Scottish Conservatism, which was by no means of the best sort, has not had men at least as notable to boast of as Scottish Whiggism. If on the one side there have been Brown, Playfair, and Jeffrey; on the other there have been Scott, and Chalmers, and Wilson. In short, all that one can say on such a subject is, that there are some men, and particularly men of sharp, clear intellect, who have a characteristic instinct towards the future, to-day called Whiggism, and to-morrow perhaps something else; and that there are other men, and particularly men of large sentimental attachments, the moorings of whose being are mostly in the past. What substantial old fellows, now unnamed, or canonized only in local and civic memory, there must have been in Scotland under the rule of Melville; transacting, with perfect relish, a considerable amount of thoroughly human existence under it; nay, poor old kerls, making their daily penny, and their annual oatmeal out of it! Yet Scottish Whiggism came to sweep them and the whole world of Dundas away, and who can now doubt that it was right it should?

Of Jeffrey's services as a Scotch Whig—how, gradually, from being a mere cadet in the ranks of the party, he came to be one of its chiefs and leaders; how Scotch Whiggism itself, at first only a hand's-breadth on the horizon, grew and grew under the care of himself and his friends, linking itself with the more powerful Whiggism of South Britain, till the whole atmosphere of the island was filled with Whig doctrine and Whig anticipation; how Jeffrey became in the end a Whig Member of Parliament, and helped in that capacity to deliver the surcharged atmosphere of the flash and thunderbolt of the Reform Bill; how he assisted to direct that special fork of the flash which fell upon Scotland, and shattered there the relics of the old Dundas system; and how Scotland willingly received him back from Parliament, when this service was done, as a Judge in her

Supreme Court of Law, appointed by a Whig Government—of all this there is a sufficient account in the memoir by Lord Cockburn. Thither also we must refer our readers for an account of Jeffrey's progress in his strictly professional life—his slow introduction to practice; his feats as a counsel, and his peculiar merits and reputation in this capacity as compared with his rivals, the Clerks, the Cranstouns, the Moncreiffs, and (to add a name which the modesty of the biographer has concealed) the Cockburns of the contemporary Scottish Bar; as well as, finally, his demeanour and qualities as a Scottish Judge. It is enough here to say that, in his capacity both as a politician and as a lawyer, Jeffrey exhibited, with the highest effect, his peculiar combination of wonderful talents; and that, had he been during his whole life nothing else than a Scottish politician and a Scottish lawyer, he would still have been one of the most eminent Scotchmen of his generation. There was, indeed, a singular unity and individuality in all that he did. Whether he wrote or spoke as counsel, or gave judgment from the Bench, one still saw the same acute, clear, rapid, brilliant, peremptory, irresistible little creature. Were one to go to ornithology for a comparison, the falcon, which is said to be the strongest and most courageous bird of its size, might stand for the type of Jeffrey. With what a clear, brown, bright, almost too unabashed eye he saw everything; how readily he took wing; how rapidly and easily, whether in a straight line, or in descending circles, he bore himself to his object! His fluency alone astonished slow people. A good heavy Glasgow citizen who was defendant in a suit, after having listened with open mouth to the torrent of words in which Jeffrey, who was counsel for the plaintiff, addressed the Court against him, took out his watch and declared that, by a calculation according to the number of words uttered in a minute, the gentleman must have spoken the English language twice over in three hours. And as Jeffrey, though different from other Scottish writers, was still quite Scottish as a writer, so as a lawyer and a judge, though differing from his Scottish compeers, he was also essentially Scottish. Between such a man as Jeffrey, as representing the Scottish Bar, for example, and such a man as Follett, as representing the English, there was all the difference that there is between the two countries. In Jeffrey on the Bench, interrupting counsel in their pleadings, and keeping them to the point, somewhat to their discomfiture, one saw the same critical intellect that presided judicially over British literature in the *Edinburgh Review*; and yet all was in strict keeping, and Jeffrey was a true type of an able Scottish judge.

After all, however, as all the world knows, the main and char-

acteristic performance of Jeffrey's life, the special stroke of Scottish emphasis which it fell to him to inflict (if that word will appease our English friends in the midst of so much ultra-Scotticism) upon the condition of British society in the nineteenth century, was the *Edinburgh Review*. We have to regard Jeffrey more closely, therefore, as the Editor and chief support, during twenty-seven years, of this famous Scottish periodical. *Scottish* periodical, we say; for though Sydney Smith was one of the Edinburgh conclave of young men by whom it was started, and though many distinguished Englishmen were among its contributors, the editorship, from the very first, devolved upon Jeffrey; and more than half the regular contributors—and these the most familiar to the editor, if not the closest to the centre of publication—were Scotchmen. Jeffrey alone contributed, between the commencement of the Review in October 1802, at which time he was a briefless barrister of twenty-nine years of age and just married, and his resignation of the editorship in June 1829, when he was appointed, in his fifty-sixth year, to the Deanship of the Scottish Bar, about two hundred separate articles,—that is, on an average, two articles to every number. In the first number he had six articles; and in not a few of the earlier numbers he had as many as four or five. Nothing seems to have interrupted his attention to the Review—neither the growing claims of his profession; nor the poignancy of his sad widowerhood in 1805; nor his romantic voyage to America, in 1813, to wed his second wife. Even in his old age, Lord Cockburn and Jeffrey's own letters give us to understand, when the Review, after the death of the intervening editor, Mr. Macvey Napier, came under the management of his son-in-law, the present editor, Mr. Empson, he returned to it, like a septuagenarian re-introduced by circumstances to his first and somewhat aged love, and would often, in his quiet evenings at Craigcrook, dabble again in editorial labours to amuse himself, and read or punctuate a favourite article. After his resignation of the editorship, however, in 1829, he contributed but three papers from his own pen. But between 1802 and 1829, the Review was more accurately and completely identified with his person than it is usual for any such periodical now to be identified with the person of even an active editor. What Jeffrey was, the Review was; and in his own series of contributions to its pages, its general scope, spirit, and power to influence were very adequately represented.

* In the collection of his contributions to the Review, selected and republished by Jeffrey himself eight years ago, and containing about half of the whole number, the papers are loosely distributed under seven heads. A glance at these heads, and at

the varied nature of the contents under each, is calculated to give a lively impression of Jeffrey's readiness and versatility as a writer, and of his competence to the task of a universal observer and critic amid the passing phenomena of his time. It will be sufficient for us, in order to obtain a closer view of his talents and endeavours in this walk, to glance first at his writings on political topics, and then at his more numerous essays on subjects of general literature. To his performances as an occasional adventurer in the field of abstract and metaphysical discussion we can allude only incidentally.

For a definition of Jeffrey's principles as a politician and a political writer we have not far to seek. He was, both in his writings and his conduct, a consistent Whig; and if the reader is capable, as he may be with Lord Cockburn's help, of still farther discriminating between an English Whig and a Scottish Whig—between the Whiggism of Holland House, London, and the Whiggism of the Parliament House in Edinburgh—he will be master of a yet closer definition of Jeffrey's politics by thinking of him as a *Scottish Whig*. A distinguished and conscientious member of that great party, representing so large a mass of British sentiment and opinion, which may be considered to have had Fox for its hero, and of which Lord John Russell is now the most characteristic relic,—but a member of that party, who, being Scotch by his nativity and in his circumstances, not only had the special duty allotted to him of superintending the applications of Whiggism to that portion of British society which lies north of the Tweed, but, moreover, contributed largely, by his intellectual activity in the cause, to infuse something of Scottish theory into British Whiggism in general, and to blend, as it were, the two political atmospheres which the Tweed separates,—such, in politics both practical and speculative, was Jeffrey. In this respect, also, therefore, we regard Jeffrey as properly an agency in the gradual diffusion through British thought of the element of modern Scotticism. It is indeed a fact which no reasoning can rob of its significance, that though the battle of Whiggism, as a practical movement, was fought in London, (and necessarily so, Parliament being there), the literary part of the business was done in Edinburgh. The buff and the blue were worn in England in mere coats and waistcoats, articles whose explanatory power, as regards the creed which they symbolized, reached no farther, as one may say, than just dogmatically affirming the Whig proposition, and declaring that there were so many backs and breasts in support of it; it was in Scotland, the country of emphatic articulation, that Whiggism mounted to the head, and that the Whig colours were used not only in the costume of men, but also in the costume of a periodical. Burke,

indeed, had in some respects been the literary organ of Whiggism; but Burke was an Irishman. Charles Fox, too, was *par excellence* the Whig orator; but his oratory consisted rather in splendid practical assertions of English Whig feeling on cases as they occurred, than in connected elucidations of the theory of Whiggism. And at a later period, when Holland House was the centre and rendezvous of the working Whigs—the place where the prospects of the party were talked over and measures from day to day concocted—the severer ratiocination of the party was still transacted in Edinburgh, or at least reserved for the *Edinburgh Review*. How much influence Scotland thus had in modifying the theory of British Whiggism, and moulding the general body of Whig doctrine into its final shape as a fixed political creed, would appear more distinctly if one were to compare the expositions of Whiggism given by the practical English Whigs at the beginning of the present century, with the expositions of it which have become current since it sustained the emphasising stroke of Scottish speculation. Jeffrey was one of the men who contributed most to this result. Indeed, if there is any part of his writings where he shows more than in another that tendency to fundamental propositions in which, as compared with some of his eminent countrymen, we have remarked that he was deficient, it is in his essays on general politics. They are perhaps as deep things as could be written in connexion with Whiggism; very much deeper thinking might have parted the connexion. Most serviceable and safe in the concrete, or as a rule of political action in troubled times, Whiggism in the abstract, as even Whigs admit, lies so far on this side of the intellectually extreme, that any ambitious gentleman bound for that region must needs go through the other side of it, whether he means to return or not. But Jeffrey was most at home precisely at about the requisite distance from the intellectually extreme, and was, therefore, the very man to do his best scientifically when expounding Whiggism. Take, accordingly, the following passage, which expresses what we firmly believe was Jeffrey's deepest and most enduring conviction in politics:—

“The whole difference between a good and a bad government appears to us to consist in this particular, viz., in the greater or the less facility which it affords for the early, the gradual and steady operation of the substantial power of the community upon its constituted authorities; while the freedom, again, and ultimate happiness of the nation depend on the degree in which the substantial power is possessed by a greater or a smaller, and a more or less moral and instructed part of the whole society—a matter almost independent of the form or name of the government, and determined in a great degree by the progress which the society itself has made in civilisation

or refinement. . . The great point is to ensure a free, an authoritative, and an uninterrupted communication between the ostensible administrators of the national power, and its actual constituents and depositaries; and the chief distinction between a good and a bad government consists in the degree in which it affords the means of such a communication. The main end of government, to be sure, is, that wise laws should be enacted and enforced; but such is the condition of human infirmity, that the hazard of sanguinary contentions about the exercise of power is a much greater and more imminent evil than a considerable obstruction in the making or execution of the laws; and the best government, therefore, is not that which promises to make the best laws, and to enforce them most rigorously, but that which guards best against the tremendous conflicts to which all administrations of government, and all exercise of political power, are so apt to give rise. It happens fortunately, indeed, that the same arrangements which most effectually ensure the peace of society against those disorders, are also, on the whole, the best calculated for the purposes of wise and efficient legislation. But we do not hesitate to look upon the negative or preventive virtues as of a far higher cast than their positive and active ones; and to consider a representative legislature as incomparably of more value when it truly enables the efficient force of the nation to control and direct the executive, than when it merely enacts wholesome statutes in its legislative capacity." — *Review of Leckie's Essay on Government, written in 1812: see Contributions, vol. iii.*

Such is Jeffrey's version of the Whig principle in politics, and there is no principle more frequently reiterated in his writings. Again and again he recurs to it, sometimes expounding it formally, as above, sometimes incidentally referring to it, but always in such a way as to shew the supreme value in which he held it. That in every community there is a class holding the real and substantial power, whoever may be the person or persons in official authority, and on whatever supposed tenure they exercise that authority; that the extent of this class, its proportion to the whole community, as well as its character and composition, varies with the degree of civilisation to which the community has attained; that, in every case, the appropriate constitution is that set of devices which shall bring the opinion of the class who have the power most directly and surely to bear upon those who are in authority; that in England, and other similarly situated countries, where the class who have the power are numerous, and composed of very various elements, the best set of devices for the purpose in question consists in what is called Parliamentary or Representative government; that probably this is the ultimate kind of government attainable by civilized men; and that, in England, therefore, the proper course to be adopted by political reformers is neither, on the one hand, to quarrel with

this form of government, out of any theoretical preference for the supposed social energy of an absolute executive, nor, on the other, to attack the existing executive form of a Limited Hereditary Monarchy, out of any theoretical preference for the greater logical simplicity of Republicanism, but to keep up continually the play and stroke of the real power upon the recognised executive, by at once and immediately admitting to a share in the representation any new ingredient of real power that time or education may develop, nay, even to foster in the community every tendency to such an extension of the real power throughout the mass of the hitherto unfranchised,—such, stated in the most general terms, was the theory of Whiggism, as propounded by Jeffrey, and as disseminated by his influence through Scotland and England.

Now, of the speculative merit of such a reproduction of the Whig theory there can be but one opinion. Jeffrey here, we believe, did a real feat of Scottish generalization, and assisted political thought for ever by the lucid expression of one stage of it. And in what stead this cardinal notion stood to Jeffrey himself, what clearness and unity of purpose it gave to all his subordinate speculations in social matters, may be seen by a reference to his numerous political and historical sketches. Farther than this, too, it cannot be denied that the notion, in his hands and in those of his Whig associates and disciples, did immense public service. Permeating the whole body of British society, it dissolved and disintegrated much of the remaining national Toryism; and as all the great political achievements of the Whig party, during the generation preceding the present—the Catholic Emancipation, the Abolition of Colonial Slavery, Economical Retrenchment, and the Reform Bill, were logical consequences of the Whig principle in the whole, so they were, doubtless, accelerated by this modification of it. If, however, we lift up the speculation itself by its roots, and examine how far it is a permanent and all-sufficing generalization in political science, we shall feel that it leaves us still in that condition of mere progress towards a final truth, which our Yankee friends describe by the term “seekers.” It might be shewn, and Jeffrey himself had a glimpse of the fact, that the whole speculation proceeds on the view that government is based on a negation. The historical origin of government, according to Jeffrey, was precisely this, that, in early communities, strong and often unscrupulous individuals grasped at the supreme power, and that the other powerful men in the community made the best terms they could with these individuals, that is, struggled in a rude way to subject the inevitable one authority to the existing multifarious power. Now, whatever truth there may be in this asser-

tion, considered as a fact in the natural history of government, it is clear that, unless something be postulated over the fact—some divine law ordaining and inhering in the fact, however it happened—some *a priori* necessity for the human race of government as such—then all government, from first to last, resolves itself into nothing more than the neutralization of one thing by another thing; of usurpation, direct or inherited, by organized resistance. Jeffrey, we think, would not have accepted this as his belief, if it had been nakedly proposed to him; but that the germs of such a belief lay in his political creed, may be inferred from his explicit statement in the foregoing passage, that he considered the merits of Parliamentary government to consist far less in its energy as an instrumentality for initiating wholesome positive laws, (in which respect, he admits, some have maintained its inferiority to Despotism,) than in its negative virtues as a means of enabling the scattered power of the nation to control its centralized executive. At all events, the belief we mention is the actual conclusion in which those who have carried out Jeffrey's principles to their logical extreme have at length ended. That all government is but an elaborate negation of the right to govern, a complicated equation the result of which is zero, a mere organized system of interferences to neutralize previous interferences; and that, consequently, the whole tendency of civilisation is to abolish Government, and to bring society to that state in which all men and women shall be so many independent self-governed atoms, and society itself a mere aggregate of such—this is the theory now creeping into vogue. Now for such as adopt this theory, Whiggism, whether as expounded by Jeffrey or by any one else, is evidently too narrow. Political duty, according to them, consists in speeding on the great consummation of No-government to which all things tend; and they are inclined to hold that the way to this is not so much through any rigorous or professed constitutionalism, as through the intervening term of democracy, or even a succession of mutually weakening struggles between democracy and despotism. Against all this another class of thinkers protest. Caring little for researches into the primeval origin of Governments, and assuming that in the modifications which Government has undergone as to form since the days of the Nimrods and the Nebuchadnezzars down to those of the Peels and the Polks, there has doubtless, as everywhere else, been a law of evolution at work, they hold that Government itself is an imperishable necessity of social existence, a specific mode or forthgoing of human energy in the associated state. They hold that society itself has a life and activity, distinct from the lives and activities of the individuals which compose it, involving these but not logically reducible into these;

and the manifestations of this general social life they regard as things of supreme import—as, in fact, the *acts of the human race* as such. Governments of all forms, accordingly, they regard as the organs of volition and expression belonging to this higher life of society, the organs whose business it specially is to cogitate at every moment what new step society shall take, what new condition it shall impose upon itself with a view to some end. Hence, instead of preferring those Governments whose excellence is chiefly negative, they are disposed to prefer those which, from their nature, abound most in positive energy—which are the readiest to seize good notions of all kinds, shape them into laws and institutions, and so work them fast up into the condition and circumstances of the people. As to the precise form of Government that would do this best, they are, however, all at sea. It may be asserted that here again, however, there is a manifest tendency to burst the walls of constitutional Whiggism. Jeffrey, indeed, persuaded himself that the form of Government which he preferred for its negative merits might also be shown to be the best in respect of sound legislative energy. But, as the sight becomes more frequent of that wreck of bills which the recess of every Parliamentary session leaves floating up and down in the public limbo, one or two small measures perhaps having been the sole product of many months—the persons in question begin to despair and to look about for new possibilities. Some, as we know, fell back upon the resolute moral desire as a refuge from the intellectual confusion; and, wishing vehemently for a wise despotism, would almost tolerate a despotism never so foolish. Others, applying themselves with a more sanguine faith to the problem of achieving the desired end without retrogression, scheme out a kind of theocratic democracy of the future, in which peoples, while governing themselves, shall be constantly pervaded by an inventive social energy, and shall to some extent commit the articulate expression of that energy to special social functionaries.

But though men may roam in deserts they must live in houses; and there are many who, though quite competent to such excursions into the regions of the intellectually extreme in politics, and even accustomed to them, still, feeling the necessity of having a roof above their heads against the wind and weather of present fact, return contentedly after every excursion to the comforts of homely Whiggism. Jeffrey himself, as his writings show, had now and then, notwithstanding his practical fidelity to this creed, occasional doubts, and wanderings, and surmises. Towards the end of his life, in particular, it seems to have been with a dazzled and hesitating eye that he looked forward into the increasing ghastliness of the European future. It is indeed

a thought-distracting, theory-upsetting, sorrow-inflicting, consistency-killing element—this element of politics and political speculation ! Nowhere are fools more dogmatic, nowhere are wise men more sad and silent ; nowhere are wise men and fools, folly and wisdom, commingled and confounded more inextricably. Flashes of light through firmaments of darkness ; a few strong instinctive convictions, a few leading doctrinal generalities, struggling with a chaos of facts which they cannot organize—such is now the science of politics. The sun may yet shine, and truth and certainty lay claim to this region too ; meanwhile men must grope. Hence again we say, it were well if men, without giving themselves political names at all, or at least without setting much store by these names, could consent to view each case as it occurred in the light of its own immediate merits—a so-called Whig now and then, for example, saying a word for what is beautiful in the antique ; and a so-called Tory blowing the blast which is to dethrone a tyrant Bomba. Perhaps something of this immediate sensitiveness to right and wrong in themselves, rather than any respect for the Horatian maxim, “*in medio tutissimius*,” has been the secret of that moderation of opinion which has distinguished most genial and sagacious men who have been obliged to take part in politics—the moderate Whiggism of a Jeffrey, on the one hand ; on the other, the moderate Toryism of a Scott. For modern use, indeed, one would be inclined to supplement the Horatian maxim, thus:—*In medio tutissimus ibis ; in omnibus tamen rectius ages, si et extrema mediteris*.

It is like passing from the smoke and din of the town to the pure air and quietness of the country to pass from Jeffrey in his connexion with politics, to Jeffrey in his connexion with literature. Here too, we have to note as the first fact with respect to the influence which was exercised, in the person of Jeffrey, over the judgment and the feelings of Britain generally, that that influence, whether favourable or not, was Scottish. As the successive modifications of Whig doctrine during the first thirty years of this century emanated from Edinburgh, so, from the same place, and, in the pages of the same periodical, there issued a more regular, more rapid, more consistent, and more influential series of criticisms on the works of contemporary British authors than from any other place in Great Britain. The *Quarterly* and other Reviews might, in some respects, contest the palm with the *Edinburgh*, in point of literary excellence and ability during the period in question, though even on this head there might be some doubts ; but as a critical organ, as a recognised authority in the literary republic for whose quarterly judgments on new books readers waited with interest and authors with trembling, the *Edinburgh* had no com-

petitor. There were both English and Scottish bards at that time, but there were, strictly speaking, only Scotch reviewers. Byron's lines, where he makes the genius of Caledonia address Jeffrey, whom she has just rescued from "Little's leadless pistol," are more than a satire.

"My son," she cried, "ne'er thirst for gore again,
Resign the pistol and resume the pen ;
O'er politics and poesy preside,
Boast of thy country and Britannia's pride !
For long as Albion's heedless sons submit,
Or Scottish taste decides on English wit,
So long shall last thine unmolested reign,
Nor any dare to takè thy name in vain."

We declare this to be but a satiric myth embodying a real fact. Somewhere about the beginning of the nineteenth century, the genius of Caledonia, residing then with her more buxom and less bony, though somewhat more matronly, sister, the genius of Albion, in the place assigned for the habitation of such entities, *did* meditate another stroke of Scottish emphasis across the general condition of Britain ; and *did*, after consulting with her sister, and obtaining her assent, (she was somewhat sleepy and in a very good humour at the time,) speed down to Scotland in search of a Scotchman fit to execute her purpose by becoming a critic of all British literature. She hovered, for some time, uncertain, over the land of her care, now glancing at the Highlands, now at the Lowlands ; at last, however, she rested, as was natural, over Edinburgh, and discerned the object of her search in the acute, fluent, penetrating little lawyer, living among his books, and at that very moment, we will suppose, reading one of them to his young wife in their small establishment in Buccleuch Place. She liked him all the better for her purpose, that he had had some experience of an English university, spoke with an English accent, and was, on the whole, of a sweet generous disposition, rather English than Scotch. And so, by agreement between the two sisters, Jeffrey was placed in the chair of British criticism, and called upon to pass his judgments both on English and Scottish authors. Sister Albion has sometimes since, we hear, repented of her share in the arrangement, and had cross words with Caledonia on the subject ; but being of the noblest temper, she admits, on the whole, that the arrangement was a good one, and that England as well as Scotland has benefited by it.

• One qualification which Jeffrey possessed for the task assigned to him, in a degree greater perhaps than any other Scotchman of that time, was extensive knowledge of, and real delight in, the works which constitute, in their series, the past wealth of

English literature. Always fond of quiet domestic leisure, rather than violent modes of exercise, and always a diligent and rapid reader, he had probably gone through as large a course of reading in the standard British authors, as any of his most cultivated English contemporaries. And while our great prose-writers, whether of the more heavy and severe, or of the more light and sparkling style, had had a due share of his attention, he had still revelled with a pleasure which custom never made less, in the richer and more fantastic compositions of the older poets. Shakespeare was almost a boundless enthusiasm with him; Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton shared the second place in his regards; with the poetry of the Elizabethan era he was more than usually familiar; and he admired with a just sense of degree, the strength of Dryden, the wit and polish of Pope, the charming grace of Goldsmith, and the fervid genius of Burns. This familiarity with all varieties of literary beauty, this extensive acquaintance with the authors, who—according to a favourite phrase of his own, of which somehow we are now growing ashamed—are to be regarded as “the best models” of English literature, very soon developed, in a mind naturally both sensitive and shrewd, that peculiar aptitude for at once relishing or disliking anything new in literature, which we designate by the word *taste*. It was the *taste* of Jeffrey that constituted his special accomplishment as a critic: where that was right, he was right; where that was at fault, he was at fault. It was with this taste, the compound result in him of his native powers and tendencies, and his familiar acquaintance with the established “models,” that he came forth to meet the tide of new books which flowed in upon him from all the sources of contemporary British authorship—the Scotts, and Byrons, and Crabbes, and Campbells, and Southey's, and Wordsworth's of a new and abounding era. His self-appointed task was that he, the Scotchman Jeffrey, should tell of every important new literary composition as it came out, whether he liked it or not, and what passages he liked, and what he did not like in it, and something, also, of his reasons for so liking and disliking. This, and nothing else, was the task which Jeffrey prescribed to himself as a critic.

He performed the task frankly and honestly. By nature the most “sweet-blooded” of creatures, neither malice, nor envy, nor political difference interfered to make him speak ill, where he thought well, of an author. On the other hand, neither private friendship nor political agreement prevented him from expressing a severe opinion where he thought it right to do so. He sent the proof-sheets of one of his most severe reviews of Scott to Scott himself, on the very day he was going to dine with him. Moore, with whom he fought a duel, because Moore chose to con-

strue his remarks on his *Little's Poems* into an accusation of personal profligacy, lived to be his guest at Craighcrook, and to sing songs on his lawn. Byron learnt to call him "Dear Jeffrey," and devoted a stanza of reconciliation to him in one of the cantos of *Don Juan*. And if Southey and Wordsworth never quite forgave him, this was on account of the peculiarity of the case; and the peculiarity was on their side, and not on his. The fact is, that Jeffrey's whole procedure as a critic, his eulogies on some authors, his attacks on others, his praises of one of an author's compositions, his dispraises of other compositions of the same author, his mingled praises and dispraises of one and the same book, all exhibited what was most singularly his qualification for the task he had assumed—his honest unhesitating reliance on his own taste. When we said some time ago that Jeffrey, like a falcon, looked about him with a sharp, clear, and almost too unbashful eye, what we meant to indicate was precisely this reliance on the competence of his own momentary judgment, this freedom from intellectual diffidence, this exquisite power of pronouncing a thing right or wrong, correct or incorrect, on the mere faith of his own instant sensation of it. Men differ very much in this respect. There are some men, and these often men of real energy and resolution, who possess little or nothing of this unfailing opinionativeness, and who, when a matter is presented to them for the first time, rather take it trustingly as it is given, and let themselves be passively affected by it, than meet it, as it were, at intellectual sword-point. Often, when their opinion is asked, they positively have none to give; and often, when a statement is made to them, in itself perhaps the most questionable in the world, they do not, unless it jars on some specially tender nerve, behave to it dogmatically at all, but seem rather to occupy themselves with pondering the possibilities of it. For example, when the fate of the Crystal Palace was pending, and when the one question in London, which everybody asked of everybody else, was, whether it should be kept up or removed, there were, we believe, many who, though by no means undecided when they *had* an opinion, really had no opinion whatever on this particular matter, and, therefore, could give none. Instantly to form an opinion in such a case, by calculating all the results positive and negative on both sides—all that would happen and all that would not happen if the Palace stood, and all that would happen and all that would not happen if it were taken away—was clearly beyond the powers of the human reason; and not having either the special feelings of an exhibitor to assist a conclusion on one side, or the special feelings of a Hyde Park proprietor to assist a conclusion on the other, they were content to be opinionless, or to listen reverentially to both

opinions, or to abominate the whole subject, or perhaps at last to be talked into one of the opinions by others. So also, there are persons who, when anything in art or literature comes before them challenging their admiration, and recommended by high authority, admire it or not, as the case may be; but, if they do not admire it, will often shrink from saying so, not from caution, but from a proneness to fancy that there may be more in the thing than meets the eye. When their feelings are not deeply stirred for or against, their tendency is to be neutral, or if they must speak, to say either what is expected, or, out of revenge, the very reverse. They will even laugh sometimes when they do not see the joke, if only there is testimony to its existence. It was quite different with Jeffrey. He had none of this intellectual bashfulness, which disqualifies for affirming or denying, except on occasions when the affirmation or denial must be vehement and continuous. He met all things at intellectual sword-point, and approved or condemned, right and left, without any hesitation. Possibly his habits as a lawyer may have had something to do with this; the mere practice of criticism, likewise, strengthened the tendency to criticise; but Jeffrey was a critic by nature. Whether in politics or in literature he was ready at once with a distinct and honest judgment whenever he was asked for it. In going over the French Revolution, for example, which he has done once or twice in his political and historical papers, he alternates between praise and dispraise almost as regularly as if he had been a criticising piston; now dwelling with approbation on what he considers a great and splendid act of policy in the leaders of that movement, and again exhibiting some blunder, by which, according to his judgment, the movement was, from the first, vitiated and ruined. And so in his remarks on a novel, a play, or a poem. Generally, his good nature and his real enjoyment of literary excellence, led him to devote most space to the praise, when it was possible to praise at all; but there is also almost invariably an enumeration at the end of blemishes or defects; and sometimes in one and the same page, or even in one and the same sentence, the author is lauded highly for his merits and blamed severely for his faults. This character in your novel is good and natural, that absurd and unnatural; this poem in your collection is beautiful and striking, that tame and mawkish; this image in the verse is highly poetical, that extravagant and obscure:—such, allowing for the larger space usually assigned to the praise, was Jeffrey's invariable mode of addressing the subjects of his criticism. Let us illustrate this by a quotation or two taken at random.

On Byron's Tragedies.—"Considered as poems, we confess they appear to us to be rather heavy, verbose, and inelegant—deficient in the

passion and energy which belong to the other writings of the noble author—and still more in the richness of imagery, the originality of thought, and the sweetness of versification for which he used to be distinguished. They are for the most part solemn, prolix, and ostentatious, lengthened out by large preparations for catastrophes which never arrive, and tantalising us with slight specimens and glimpses of a higher interest, scattered thinly up and down many weary pages of declamation. . . . There are some sweet lines and many of great weight and energy; but the general march of the verse is cumbrous and unmusical. His lines do not vibrate like polished lances, at once strong and light, in the hands of his persons, but are wielded like clumsy batons in a bloodless affray. Instead of the graceful familiarity and idiomatical melodies of Shakespeare, they are apt, too, to fall into clumsy prose in their approaches to the easy and colloquial style; and, in the loftier passages, are occasionally deformed by low and common images that harmonize but ill with the general solemnity of the diction.”—*Edinburgh Review*, 1822.

On Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel.—“From the various extracts we have now given our readers will be enabled to form a tolerably correct judgment of this poem; and if they are pleased with those portions of it which have now been exhibited, we may venture to assure them that they will not be disappointed by the perusal of the whole. The whole night journey of Delorane, the opening of the wizard's tomb, the march of the English battle, and the parley before the walls of the castle, are all executed with the same spirit and poetical energy which we think is conspicuous in the specimens we have already extracted, and a great variety of short passages occur in every part of the poem, which are still more striking and meritorious, though it is impossible to detach them, without injury, in the form of a quotation. . . . There are many passages, as we have already insinuated, which have the general character of heaviness, such as the minstrel's account of his preceptor and Delorane's lamentation over the dead body of Musgrave. But the goblin page is, in our opinion, the capital deformity of the poem. We have already said that the whole machinery is useless; but the magic studies of the lady, and the rifled tomb of Michael Scott, give occasion to such admirable poetry that we can, on no account, consent to part with them. The page, on the other hand, is a perpetual burden to the poet and to the reader; it is an undignified and improbable fiction, which excites neither terror, admiration, nor astonishment, but needlessly debases the strain of the whole work, and excites at once our incredulity and contempt.”—*Edinburgh Review*, 1805.

On Keats's Poems.—“We had never happened to see either of these volumes till very lately, and have been exceedingly struck with the genius they display and the spirit of poetry which breathes through all their extravagance. . . . They are full of extravagance and irregularity, rash attempts at originality, interminable wanderings, and excessive obscurity. . . . But they are flushed all over with the rich lights of fancy, and so coloured and bestrewed with the flowers of

poetry, that even when perplexed and bewildered in their labyrinths it is impossible to resist the intoxication of their sweetness, or to shut our hearts to the enchantments they so lavishly present. . . . The thin and scanty tissue of his story (*Endymion*) is merely the light framework on which his florid wreaths are suspended; and while his imaginations go rambling and entangling themselves everywhere, like wild honeysuckles, all idea of sober reason, and plan, and consistency, is utterly forgotten and 'strangled in their waste fertility.' A great part of the work, indeed, is written in the strangest and most fantastical manner that can be imagined. It seems as if the author had ventured everything that had occurred to him in the shape of a glittering image or striking expression—taken the first word that presented itself to make up a rhyme, and then made that word the germ of a new cluster of images—a hint for a new excursion of the fancy—and so wandered on, equally forgetful whence he came and heedless whither he was going, till he had covered his pages with an interminable arabesque of connected and incongruous figures, that multiplied as they extended, and were only harmonized by the brightness of their tints and the graces of their forms. In this rash and headlong career he has, of course, many lapses and failures. There is no work, accordingly, from which a malicious critic could cull more matter for ridicule, or select more obscure, unnatural, or absurd passages. But it is, in truth, at least as full of genius as of absurdity."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1820.

On a Number of Dickens's Copperfield.—"Bless you, my dear Dickens, and happy new-years for centuries to you and yours! A thousand thanks for your kind letter of December, and for your sweet, soothing *Copperfield* of the new-year. It is not a hinging or marking chapter in the story of the Life, but it is full of good matter, and we are all the better for it. The scene with Agnes is the most impressive, though there is much promise in Traddles. Uriah is too disgusting; and I confess I should have been contented to have heard no more of the Micawbers. But there is no saying what you may make of them."—*Letter to Mr. Dickens, Jan. 6, 1850.*—*Lord Cockburn's Life*, vol. ii. pp. 464, 465.

These extracts, though, with the exception of that on Keats, which is really a fine piece of meaning finely expressed, they do not illustrate sufficiently Jeffrey's powers as a writer—the delicacy and tact of his discrimination, his clear and genial wit, and his happy fluency in choice and garnished and lightly moving phrases—yet convey an exact and adequate idea of his manner as a critic. The "beauty and blemish principle," if we may so express it, was the principle of criticism in the application of which to the writings of his day Jeffrey was a master. To point out the special beauties of a poem or novel, to append or interweave an enumeration of the special blemishes, and to illustrate both by ample and appropriate extracts—this was the standing formula according to which almost all the critical papers in the

Edinburgh Review were written, during the editorship of Jeffrey. It was the organ for telling society at large, and ladies and gentlemen of taste in particular, what they were to think of the last new books. It performed on the large scale, and with a kind of princely decisiveness to which there is nothing now comparable, that important social function which smaller periodicals now attempt to discharge, when, for example, they consult public convenience by answering, *ex cathedra*, the question so often put at private parties, "What do you think of the new number of *Bleak House*?" As readers of the present day, and especially those unopinionative readers who are apt to take *Bleak House* or anything else as it comes, without making up their minds in any distinct manner as to its merits or demerits, owe a debt of gratitude to the smaller periodicals which point these out; so, in the first quarter of this century, and in a degree a hundred times greater, were readers indebted to the *Edinburgh Review*. To pronounce judgments on new books and to disseminate Whig principles, were the two professed ends of the Review; and as its fidelity to the one end was undoubted, so no one could deny the vigilance with which it attended to the other.

It is a known fact, however, exemplified nowhere more conspicuously than in the progress of the *Edinburgh Review* itself, that the sketchy "beauty and blemish" species of criticism in which Jeffrey excelled, has now passed out of date, and been succeeded, at least in all our higher periodicals, by a kind of criticism intrinsically deeper and more laborious. Partly by reason of that enormous increase of books which has made it a physical necessity to devolve the task of general literary censorship upon the weekly periodicals, and even on the daily newspapers; partly by reason of the rise among us of an altogether higher sense of what criticism is, or may be—the papers which now constitute the staple of our magazines and quarterlies are of a kind of which similar periodicals in older times exhibit few or no examples. It is not, perhaps, at least it is not in all cases, that there is greater positive ability than formerly in those who betake themselves to this species of writing—for it would be no easy thing to find a person in any class or any profession with a greater fund of talent available for any purpose whatever than existed in Jeffrey; it is that the new principle which usage has, since Jeffrey's time, established in the art of periodical writing, compels those who betake themselves to it, be their abilities what they may, to task these abilities harder. Merely to note the beauties and blemishes of a new book, or the merits and defects of a known author in that rapid superficial way which enables the public to say whether the book or author has been noticed favourably or otherwise, is not now the business of a

critic in the *Quarterlies*. What is usually required of him is, either some original disquisition, for which a book or a certain number of books may furnish the test; or some critical appreciation of a new intellectual tendency running through simultaneous scores of books, several of which are named by way of specimen; or, some thorough dissection of an important new book, considered as the product of a peculiar mode of thought exhibited nowhere else; or, lastly, and perhaps most frequently, some elaborate literary monograph, or study of character, in which the attempt is made to delineate in exact portraiture the features of some representative man, and to trace the stamp of these in his writings or the circumstances of his life. It is needless, in illustration of this change in the nature of our periodical literature, to do more than allude to those occasional essays of Macaulay and Carlyle, which, if they did not assist to bring about the change, at least mark, in a very striking manner, that a change has taken place. Side by side with the republished contributions of these and some later writers to our periodical literature, Jeffrey's reprinted criticisms appear slight and ephemeral. The truth is, that his literary criticisms rank lower, in point of thought or permanent intellectual contents, than his political articles. In these articles, as we have seen, there is often a marked tendency to general speculation,* a successful effort to reach a scientific principle. There is far less of this in his literary criticisms. General disquisition, indeed, is not wanting, and leading canons of taste are duly implied or laid down; but, on the whole, the papers have the appearance of light things dashed off on the "beauty and blemish" principle, by a brilliant and happy writer, whose simple business it was to read new books and tell the public frankly what he thought of them. Considered as such, however—as criticisms of the hour—as the applications of one man's taste and judgment, sometimes in the form of reproof and chastisement, to the whole current literature of his generation—we have no series of criticisms approaching to them in merit. Jeffrey, in this sense, was truly the king of critics. If he has not left behind him more solid monuments of his own literary genius, it is because, like a true king, he occupied himself so assiduously with the task of governing and controlling—of administering, as it were, day by day, portions of his individuality into the course of affairs as they were. That, while performing this task so well, he was able at the same time to sustain the character of being himself a fine and graceful writer, is so much merit in addition. Slight as the texture of Jeffrey's criticisms is, there are passages in them of such happy and ingenious and even rich and eloquent expression, that no series of "Elegant Extracts" would now be complete that did not contain

specimens from them, as a recognised portion of our classic British literature.

Whatever may be thought of the *depth* of Jeffrey's criticisms, it must be allowed that, on the whole, they were singularly *just*. There have been, we imagine, very few men so courageous in giving opinions on things, whose opinions on things could be more fully trusted, when given. Even his critical observations on historical transactions, so distant and difficult to appreciate as those of the first French Revolution, were probably as sound as it was possible for critical observations of that nature to be. And his literary criticisms, for the most part, stand good even yet. The opinions pronounced by Jeffrey thirty or forty years ago on the works of Scott, Byron, Campbell, Crabbe, Moore, Keats, Rogers, and all the other literary chiefs of that period, are, for the most part, the opinions that people hold on the same works now; and some of the very phrases which Jeffrey used to describe his impressions as to what was characteristic in these writers, have now all the sanction of prescriptive usage. Lord Cockburn is very decided upon this point. "What poet," he asks, "whom Jeffrey condemns, continues a favourite with the public, except in the works, or in the passages, or in the qualities which he applauds?" We cannot, however, go *quite* so far as Lord Cockburn when he says this. Although Jeffrey's judgments on the poets and other writers of his time were, on the whole, as accurate as they were frank, there *are* cases in which the public has found it necessary to leave him and his criticisms far behind. Every man has his natural limitations; and there are things contemporary with every man, according to external appearance, which properly are *not* contemporary with him, but indicate preparations by nature for the future, and her tendency towards what shall be in vigour and flourish when he shall have passed away. Jeffrey, by nature, had probably more of sympathy with what was fine, and exquisite, and pathetic in literature, in its already established forms, than with what, either in thought or in method, proposed an innovation; and although the range of his intellectual appreciation was large when he directed his attention to the past, there were deep tendencies of his own time towards which, with a pertinacity which at once gave the measure of his intelligence, and shewed its strength within that measure, he remained entirely negative. It is needless to do more than allude, in illustration of this, to his criticism on Goethe in connexion with the novel of *Wilhelm Meister*, and to his long series of attacks on Wordsworth and the Lake Poets. The "This will never do" which, in both these cases, was substantially his critical verdict, can now only be regarded as an interesting example of the old in literature perturbed by the ap-

proach of the new. There are of course persons yet amongst us to whom Jeffrey's verdict in those cases seems still the right one; but for all who properly belong to our epoch, the question has been long ago ended.

The truth is, a new spirit in literature, as well as in other things, was taking possession of the age as Jeffrey passed away from it. Influences akin to those which Jeffrey resisted in his attacks on Coleridge and Wordsworth, streamed in on the mind of Britain from all sides; and before Jeffrey died he saw a very changed world. From the peaceful retreat at Craigcrook, where he spent his declining years, leading in the circle of his private friends that kindly, and sociable, and pensive home-life, of which Lord Cockburn has told us too little, but of which we obtain some beautiful and charming glimpses from his own letters, Jeffrey must have looked out with mingled feelings of surprise, admiration, and regret upon the tide of new things that time and labour were evoking all around him. In politics, a new French Revolution, a whole continent once more defying despotism, and speculations of far deeper colour than the authentic old buff and blue, came in the end to assure him—more profoundly and convincingly perhaps than he had been assured before—that men will not suffer Whiggism to be the final formula in political science. And in literature, he stood at last like a Nestor amid the warriors of a second and third generation. The Scotts, the Byrons, the Campbells, the Crabbes, the Coleridges, the Southneys, the Moores, the Mackintoshes, and the Rogerses, who were properly his contemporaries, had either passed away or taken out their superannuation; Wordsworth, whom he had attacked, was the poet-patriarch of England, removed high beyond all critical reach; the power and the glory of British literature had passed to chiefs trained within the period of his own activity—the Wilsons, and Carlyles, and Hunts, and Landors, and Macaulays, and Brewsters, and Stephens, and Hamiltons, who still live and labour among us; year after year a new name, such as that of Bulwer, or Isaac Taylor, or Dickens, or Thackeray, or Jerrold, or Tennyson, or Robert Chambers, or Hugh Miller, or John Mill, was added, before his eyes, to the list of our men of intellectual and literary eminence; and as he looked still farther along the series for what was appearing or about to be, he could discern, as of greater or less note, and of various promise, in a generation still younger, such men as Stanley, and Ruskin, and Samuel Brown, and Wilkinson, and George Wilson, and Marston, and Lewes, and Aytoun, and Kingsley, and Browning, and Patmore. Genial, and lively, and sympathetic as he was, he saw all this with a kindly and genuine interest, and with the readiest approbation of whatever was good

and beautiful. "Oh, my dear, dear Dickens!" he writes, after the receipt of one of the Numbers of *Dombey*, "what a No. 5 you have given us! I have so cried and sobbed over it last night, and again this morning; and felt my heart purified by those tears, and blessed and loved you for making me shed them, and I never can bless and love you enough." The heart that could feel so for the death of Paul Dombey had clearly lost none of its susceptibility to the charms of fine literature. But the pathos of *Dombey* is not the spirit of the age; and at the time when Jeffrey wrote these words, he cannot but have felt that *his* day was in the past, and that it had fallen to men very different from himself to do the work required by the new time.

Jeffrey, as all know, has not been the last representative of Scottish influence in British literature. He is not to be regarded as holding even the penultimate or the antepenultimate place in the series of eminent Scotchmen. Chambers and Carlyle properly come after him; Sir William Hamilton, in the field of metaphysics, more than maintains, at this very day, the ancient honours of his country; in Hugh Miller, Scotland has still a son, with features peculiarly her own, of whose manly heart, and of whose deeds in literature, any country might be proud; and even in Jeffrey's own field of literary criticism, have we not had, since Jeffrey's time, a totally different display of the Scottish genius in Christopher North and *Blackwood's Magazine*? Scottish emphasis still reigns and works as a specific element in all British thought, all British activity, and all British literature. Nay, and there will still be stroke after stroke of Scottish emphasis till Scotland shall be no more, or till, all things having been finally and for ever co-ordinated, the necessity for emphasis shall cease. But nature abhors repetitions, and every new stroke of Scottish emphasis must tell athwart British society as an impulse different in kind from all that preceded it. And so more particularly, with whatever Scotland may yet undertake in the field of literary criticism. The *Edinburgh Review*, it is true, has ceased to be, in any distinctive manner, a Scottish periodical; but Scotland, we believe, may still have, and still needs to have, a periodical of her own. Let us not be mistaken; we speak in no spirit of vain ultra-Scotticism. While it will necessarily, we believe, be the function of such a periodical, with respect to England, to emphasise certain things which it is given to Scotchmen rather than to Englishmen at the present day to know and to appreciate; it will necessarily also, we believe, be its function, with respect to Scotland, to make war on the excesses of emphasis itself, to attack bad emphasis, and to teach, by manifold allusion to what exists so splendidly in England, the beauty and grandeur of that character which accepts all things in mild and harmonious co-ordination.

- ART. II.—1. *The Birds of Australia*. By JOHN GOULD, F.R.S., &c. 7 vols. imp. folio. London, 1848.
2. *An Introduction to the Birds of Australia*. By the Same. 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1848.
3. *The Natural History of Ireland: Birds*. By WILLIAM THOMPSON, Esq., President of the Natural History and Philo-sophical Society of Belfast. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1849-51.*

THERE is no division of the animal kingdom more richly stored with numerous and diversified species, than the class of Birds. There is none more worthy of our careful study and admiration, whether we regard the wonders of their internal structure, or the beauty of their external aspect. The chaste

* We have recently observed, with most unfeigned regret, an announcement of Mr. Thompson's death. His removal in the prime of his days from this earthly scene is alike a deep distress to his numerous personal friends, and an irreparable loss to our knowledge of the natural history of his native country, of which he was the chief exponent, and on every branch of which it is known that he had accumulated large and most valuable materials, almost ready for the press. The work named above, on the "*Birds of Ireland*," had been fortunately completed by the publication of the third volume. He is, besides, the author of numerous papers in the "*Annals of Natural History*," and of an excellent "*Report on the Fauna of Ireland*," drawn up at the request of the British Association, and published in their volume for 1840.

Since writing the above note we have taken occasion to abridge the following particulars from an Irish newspaper, kindly transmitted to us by Mr. Thompson's attached friend and fellow-labourer, Robert Patterson, Esq., of Belfast, himself an able and well-known naturalist, author of a most excellent and useful "*Introduction to Zoology, for the Use of Schools*," and other works. Mr. Thompson was born at Belfast, on the 2d of November 1805. At an early age he became so captivated by those pure enjoyments which spring from the contemplation of nature, that he thenceforward devoted the greater portion of his time to the pursuits of natural history. Applying himself alike to the studious acquirement of recorded knowledge as contained in books, and to a searching and assiduous investigation of the great "*Biblia Naturæ*," he eventually became both a thorough master of the one, and a most skilful interpreter of the other. With the leading naturalists of the day he kept up a constant correspondence, and from time to time he published the results of his own investigations in various scientific journals. The principal writers on the natural history of the British Islands acknowledged themselves indebted to Mr. Thompson for most of their information regarding Ireland. He was a zealous supporter of the British Association, and cheerfully fulfilled, in succession, the duties of almost every honorary office connected with it. A continuation and completion of the "*Report*" above referred to was one of those contributions which Mr. Thompson had in view to lay before the meeting of the Association to be held in Belfast, during the current year. But alas! how vain and uncertain do we often find our prospective plans. The manuscript of the remainder of the "*Natural History of Ireland*" is, we understand, in a forward state; and we are happy to learn that the author had made arrangements for its publication, under the superintendence of two of his personal friends. Mr. Thompson had proceeded to London in the course of the present spring, to assist in making preparations for the ensuing meeting of the British Association; and having accomplished his mission he was about to return home. But he became unwell in London, and after a short illness, his premature and most deeply lamented death took place there on the 17th day of February last. See *The Mercantile Journal and Statistical Register* (of Belfast), for 30th March 1852.

blending of simple and subdued colours in some, the more showy and sumptuous adornment of others, cannot but be looked on with delight: while that perfect and pervading conformity of organization to the instinctive habits of each particular tribe, so conspicuous throughout the "manifold works" of the great Creator, is in none more plainly and pleasingly exhibited than among the now almost countless varieties of the feathered race. Birds are, moreover, the only beings which please the ear no less than they delight the eye. Bees hum, oxen bellow, and dogs bark, and many other creatures—man and beast—not seldom favour us with most discordant sounds, which each perchance may deem a "joyful noise;"—but listen to the rich outpouring of the mellow blackbird's song, or that unwearied thrush on topmost branch of some aspiring tree,

" Making sweet music out of air as sweet,"

from early morning until latest eve, and no doubt is felt that these rejoicing lays are not only cheering to the bright creatures themselves, and their beloved companions brooding unseen amid the leafy arbours, but in glad accordance with all the other harmonies of nature by which they are surrounded on this fair earth.

We need scarcely remark that Ornithology in general now presents a field so vast and varied, that the space required to exhibit even the most cursory and superficial sketch of its existing condition, viewed in all its branches, would greatly exceed the ordinary limits of a Review, even although the present Number should consist entirely of one Article, and that devoted to the feathered tribes. We must, therefore, only touch the subject slightly here and there.

The progress of Ornithology in modern times, taking a merely *numerical* view of the matter, may be judged of from the following brief record. The first edition of Linnæus's great work, the *Systema Naturæ*—(which if it did not originate certainly gave universality to the convenient *binominal* system now in use)—was published in 1735. It consisted, so far as birds are concerned, of 47 genera, containing 117 species. In the subsequent editions various genera and species were added,—the former, in the year 1766, amounting to 104, the latter to 947. Latham, the most voluminous of our own ornithological writers, scarcely concerned himself about the formation of genera, but (in 1790) he described 2951 species. More recent writers have devoted themselves chiefly to the description of new species, and the formation or indication of generic groups, justly regarding the accurate compilation of a general system of Ornithology, from the multiplied masses of the feathered tribes, and the scattered

condition of their records, as a very fearful task. Thus, the Prince of Canino (C. L. Bonaparte), in 1831, gives us 561 genera, while Mr. Swainson, a few years thereafter (1837), raises the number to 623, of which not fewer than 239 bear designations not formerly in use. The increase of *species* is not so easily ascertained, from the want of works professedly treating of the entire class of birds, but M. Vieillot, in 1823, indicated 3828 species, and C. L. Bonaparte, in 1831, 4099 species. It is well known that Linnæus had it not in his power, in consequence of his restricted intercourse with foreign lands, to acquire any intimate knowledge of the natural habits or modes of life of the great majority of his species, and that he placed them in approximation, as he best could, in conformity with their leading external characters. Had he known their habits of life, and connected these with the nicer organic distinctions which he—the Lynx-eyed—no doubt perceived, but generically disregarded, he would certainly not have arranged his species in so few and such far-spread groups. “What might have been the number of his genera,” says Mr. J. R. Gray, “had he acquired the knowledge of the vast number of species which are now known, it is not easy to conjecture, except by taking his ratio of species to genera, in comparison with those now given by authors. For example, he had in his last edition, 947 species, divided into 104 genera, so that there were about 9 species to each genus. There are now known and acknowledged by naturalists about 6000 species. If we divide these into 800 genera, it will give to each genus an average of $7\frac{1}{2}$ species, which is not much under the number given by Linnæus.” The preceding intimation given by Mr. J. R. Gray, (certainly one of our most competent authorities,) of the ascertained existence of 800 genera and 6000 species of birds was made in 1841.* We need scarcely say that great additions have been made in the course of the ten years which have since elapsed.

When we take a survey of the attributes of birds, and consider the *dimensions* of the flying species, (from which we exclude the ostrich, and other *Struthious* kinds), we shall find, that if not the largest, at least the longest winged, is represented by the Condor of South America (*Sarcorampbus gryphus*). On the other hand, the smallest is a species of humming bird (*Mellisuga minima*), found in Jamaica. We do not happen to know the weight of a heavy full-grown Condor, but its extended wings measure nearly fifteen feet from tip to tip. The

* Preface to *Genera of Birds*, 2d edition. In a recent note from Mr. Gould, that active and assiduous ornithologist informs us that the number of British birds now known is about 850; of European, about 500; while the total number ascertained may be stated at 7000.

least of all humming birds is scarcely the size of a humble bee, but its wings are long in proportion, like those of a little insect of the hawk-moth kind. Both condors and humming birds are observed at great heights. The former are often seen so high in the air as to appear like scarcely discernible specks, sweeping around in great circles. The ascertained height was on one occasion found by Humboldt to be 23,270 feet; but there is no reason to suppose that that was a necessary approximation to the limit, observations in this kind having been hitherto few and casual, and the ongoings, or rather upgoings, of nature, for the most part unrecorded amid the Alpine solitudes of the Andes. If this wide-winged bird, as is likely, actually soars beyond our powers of vision, we can then, of course, only surmise to what elevation it may attain when raised so far above

“The earthquake-rifted mountains of bright snow.”

It is, no doubt, of all the living creatures upon earth the one which can remove the farthest from it. The *terrestrial* localities of this gigantic bird are comprised in a zone which extends from about 1000 to 19,000 feet above the sea, and the height at which it habitually soars is, according to Humboldt, six times that at which clouds are suspended over the plains of Europe. When searching for food, it descends to the plains which border the bases of the Cordilleras; and Humboldt has called attention to the remarkable physiological fact, that the same individual which breathes so easily the rarified air of the loftiest regions, should sometimes suddenly descend to the sea-shore, thus passing rapidly through all climates, and every condition of atmosphere. It was formerly believed, in connexion with experimental observations on the air-pump, that no creature could exist under so low a pressure; but it is now known that the species in question breathes as freely when the barometer would indicate only thirteen inches as if it stood at thirty.* Its most frequent haunts range from 10,000 to 19,000 feet above the sea. These lofty regions are known vernacularly by the name of Condor nests, although the female is believed to lay her eggs upon the arid rock. There, perched in dreary solitude, on the crests of scattered peaks, at the very verge of the region of perpetual snow, these dark gigantic birds are seen silently reposing like melancholy spectres. But however wild and savage may be their haunts and habits, the tales narrated of their carrying

* We may here note, in respect to Humming birds, that these frail creatures, as represented by one or other of their forms, extend from Terra del Fuego to beyond the sixty-first degree of north latitude. In regard to height, they were seen by Von Tschudi at an elevation of 14,600 feet. *Fauna Peruana*. Ornithol., p. 12. The West Indian Islands, and warmer portions of South America, may, however, be regarded as the central region of Humming birds in general.

off young persons of ten or twelve years of age may be regarded as fabulous by any one who has examined their feet and talons, which, though long, and in some respects powerful, are but slightly curved. There is scarcely an authenticated instance of their assaulting even a child.*

Some curious information regarding Condors is given by Sir Francis Head. One of his companions seeing an enormous bird upon a dead horse, rode up to it, and finding the creature so gorged that it could scarcely fly, he suddenly seized it by the neck :

"No two animals can well be imagined less likely to meet than a Cornish miner and a Condor, and few would have calculated, a year ago, when the one was hovering high above the snowy pinnacles of the Cordilleras, and the other many fathoms beneath the surface of the ground in Cornwall, that they would ever meet to wrestle and 'hug' upon the wide desert plain of Villa Vicencia."†

After a hard struggle, and some dubiety as to the result, the Cornish man prevailed, and slew the Condor.

The latitudinal distribution of this noted bird, though widely spread, is yet confined within certain limits, and seems to be regulated by the existence of mountain crests of great elevation. It extends southwards from the Equator to the Straits of Magellan, a range of more than fifty degrees ; but it does not appear to spread northwards from the Equator into New Grenada, beyond the province of Antioquia, in the seventh degree. One of its last great resting places is, probably, the Peak of Tolima, which, nearly five degrees north of the Line, rises to an elevation of more than 18,000 feet—sufficient to satisfy the ambition of the most aspiring Condor.

Humboldt is of opinion that next to the Condor, the largest of flying birds is the Lammergeyer of the European Alps (*Gypaëtos barbatus*). We doubt not that it is one of the most expanded, in regard to stretch of wing, from tip to tip, but it is by no means a ponderous species, being short-legged and somewhat slender-bodied, with a kite-like aspect, and certainly less bulky than the great Harpy Eagle of South America, (*Falco destructor*.) We incline to think that a full-sized female Sea Eagle of our own shores would outweigh it. The great marine species of Eastern Asia (*Haliastur pelagicus*) assuredly does so. We are also of opinion that the illustrious Prussian naturalist has entirely overlooked the *Palmipedes*, or swimming birds, which possibly present us with the largest of all the winged species. A well-fed Cygnet will weigh nearly thirty pounds, and so it may be doubted

* Nuttall's *Manual of Ornithology*, vol. i. p. 36.

† *Rough Notes across the Pampas*.

if any accipitrine bird, except the Condor, would not kick the beam, when placed in the balance with a Swan of the largest size. Even as regards expanse from tip to tip of wing, few species of either land or sea exceed, or even equal, the Albatross.

In regard to the geographical distribution of birds, the most remarkable example of a widely extended, we may say of an almost unlimited range, with which we are acquainted, is that of a small shore-bird, called the Turnstone, *Tringa* (or *Strepsilas*) *interpres*. It is a well-known winter visitant of Britain, is supposed to breed in Shetland, and is known to do so along the shores of the Arctic Circle. Its nest was found by Mr. Hewitson on rocky islets off the coast of Norway, placed against a ledge, and consisting of nothing more than the shed leaves of the juniper, under a creeping branch of which, the eggs, four in number, were "snugly concealed, and admirably sheltered from the many storms by which those bleak and exposed rocks are visited, allowing just sufficient room for the bird to cover them."* Although widely spread, as a migratory species, along the shores of the nearer continent, its extra-European range is quite extraordinary. In the New World it was found by Sir John Richardson in Hudson's Bay, and is known to extend northwards along the icy shores of the Arctic Circle as far as the seventy-fifth parallel, while Mr. Darwin (we pass over many intermediate stations) obtained specimens from the Straits of Magellan. Sir William Jardine has received it from Tobago. It has been seen in Madeira, and is spread along the northern and western coasts of Africa, and onwards to the Cape of Good Hope. It is a well-known Indian species,† occurs also in China and Japan, and is distributed among the great Asiatic islands, such as Java, Sumatra, the Moluccas, and New Guinea. Lastly, it was found in New Holland by Mr. Gould. Now there is nothing in the structure of this species to explain, or in any way account for, its apparently universal distribution over all the four quarters of the globe, and the distant islands of the sea. It possesses no powers of flight which are not equally shared by several thousands of its fellow-creatures; and there are no peculiar attributes of its nature, from which we could at all infer, *à priori*, its occurrence under such an extraordinary diversity of climate and

* This choice of a rocky foundation on which to place its nest, may, of course, be modified by circumstances, but it is well to know the fact from actual observation. In most of our ordinary compiled works it is otherwise stated. Professor Savi, for example, makes the Turnstone hollow out for itself a little excavation in the sand:—"Scava una piccola buca nell' arena" (*Ornitologia Toscana*, ii. 261); and a like process is referred to by Schinz in his *Hist. Nat. des Nids*, p. 4.

† It was found by Mr. Jerdan at a singular distance from the sea—"At the Tank of Jaulnah, two hundred miles inland; and as far southward as Madras."—*Madras Journal of Science*, July 1840, p. 211.

country. Whatever the cause, it may assuredly be regarded as the most truly cosmopolite of the feathered race. It is the only species, so far as we know, which occurs in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia.* It is the only New Holland bird that is found also in Great Britain, and we know of but two others in Europe, both shore-birds,—*Terekia cinerea*, (a kind of Godwit,) and *Totanus stagnatilis*, (allied to the Redshanks,) which are likewise native to New Holland. We may mention that our common Dunlin, or sand-piper, (*Tringa cinclus*), occurs in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, the West Indies, and the great islands of the Indian Ocean, but not in Australia. It was found by our Arctic voyagers in Melville Peninsula, and has been received by M. Temminck from the island of Timor. It would thus appear, in respect to the dispersion of birds, that species of the Grallatorial order have the greatest range.

There are, however, many other instances of a wide, though not equally extended distribution. It is long since the Prince of Canino made us acquainted with the ornithological relationship of Europe and North America. He shewed that of the 503 species which were then (1838) supposed to constitute the ornithology of Europe, 100 species occurred also in America; while the American species consisted of 471, including the 100 species which it had in common with Europe.†

One of the most singular features, in a view of foreign ornithology, is what may be called the *representative system*, that is, the occurrence of species closely resembling, though not identical with, our more familiar forms. Thus, when the birds of New Holland began to attract attention, the British or European Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) was supposed to occur among them. A more minute and accurate examination shewed it to be distinct, but so nearly allied both in structure and habits, as to be *representative* of our own species. So likewise with our Icelandic and Peregrine Falcons. Neither of them exists in New Holland, but the former is represented there by *Falco hypoleucos*, the latter by *Falco melanogenys*. Even the North American Peregrine, which might more naturally be thought identical with that of Europe, from so many other points of ornithological agreement between the two countries, has now been set apart as a distinct though representative species, under the name of Duck-hawk—

* An Irish ornithologist is said to have remarked on the discovery of the Turnstone in New Holland, that it was now known in the fifth quarter of the globe.

† See the following works by Charles Lucien Bonaparte, (then) Prince of Musignano;—*Specchio comparativo delle Ornitologie di Roma e di Philadelphia*, in the 33d No. of the *Nuovo Giornale de' Letterati*, reprinted apart at Pisa, 1837; *Supplemento alla specchio comparativo*, &c., *ibid.* 1832; *A Geographical and Comparative List of the Birds of Europe and North America*, London, 1855; *Catalogo metodico degli uccelli Europei*, Bologna, 1842.

Falco anatum. It is a notable fact in regard to this last mentioned bird, (the Peregrine,) that it occurs either actually or by representation, in almost all countries, that is, over a great extent of Europe, Asia, North America, Cape Horn; the Cape of Good Hope and New Holland. We agree, however, with the Prince of Canino and Professor Kaup, that these so called local varieties are not identical.* The Curlew and its cousin-german the Whimbrel, are curiously and closely represented in New Holland by *Numenius Australis* and *Num. uropygialis*. The same may be said of several other species. Europe and Australia have each a stilted Plover, a Dotterel, and an Avocet, but the species are not identical in the two countries.†

Although so many marked examples of this representative system occur in the far Southern Continent, (as we may call New Holland,) probably no country possesses so many generic groups peculiar to itself. It is also wonderfully rich in species of the most charmingly diversified form and plumage, and remarkable, many of them, for their curious and uncommon instincts. As the result of Mr. Gould's most laborious and equally successful investigations, we have been for some time acquainted with 636 species of birds from New Holland, including Van-Dieman's Land. This is more than twice the number known not many years ago, when that intelligent and enterprising naturalist commenced his labours.

"Upon taking a general view of the Australian Ornithology," Mr. Gould remarks, "we find no species of vulture,‡ only one typical eagle, and indeed a remarkable deficiency in the number of the species of its birds of prey, with the exception of the nocturnal owls, among which the species belonging to the restricted genus *Strix*, are more numerous than in any other part of the world; a circumstance which is probably attributable to the great abundance of small quadrupeds, most of which are nocturnal in their habits.

"Among the perching birds there is a great excess of the *Insectivoræ*, *Podargi*, *Meliphagidæ*, *Maluridæ*, *Gymnorhipæ*, &c., of the *Granivoræ*, such as various species of the *Fringillidæ*, and of the *Psittacidæ* (or parrots). The latter tribe of birds is more numerous in Australia than in any other part of the world, and forms four great groups, viz., the *Calyptorhynchi*, which mainly procure their food from the *Banksiæ*, *Casuarinæ*, and *Eucalypti*,—the *Cacatuæ*, which feed upon the terrestrial *Orchidæ*, &c.—the *Trichoglossi*, which subsist upon the nectar they extract from the flower-cups and blossoms of the *Eucalypti*,—

* See Kaup, in *Ista*, (for 1847,) p. 75.

† See Gould's *Introduction to the Birds of Australia*, p. 11.

‡ We agree in this opinion with Mr. Gould. The so called New Holland vulture of Latham, is a rasorial or gallinaceous bird of a very anomalous kind, but in no way allied to the *Vulturidæ*, although Mr. Swainson considers it as the rasorial type of that flesh-eating family. We shall afterwards notice it under the name of *Wattled Tulegalla*.

and the ground and grass *Parrakeets*, which feed almost exclusively on the seeds of the various grasses that abound on the plains; the united groups amounting to nearly sixty species.

"Of the rasorial forms, while the pigeons and hemipods are numerous, the larger and typical *Gallinaceæ* are entirely wanting; their only representative being a few species of *Coturnix* and *Synoicus*. The Grallatorial birds are about equal in number to those of other countries; and among the water birds the true ducks are but few, while the *Procellariidæ* which visit the coast are in much greater abundance than in any other part of the world. On a retrospect of the whole we find a greater number of nocturnal birds than is comprised in the Ornithology of any other section of the globe. I must not omit to mention too the extraordinary fecundity which prevails in Australia, many of its smaller birds breeding three or four times in a season; but laying fewer eggs in the early spring when insect life is less developed, and a greater number later in the season, when the supply of insect food has become more abundant. I have also some reason to believe that the young of many species breed during the first season, for, among others, I frequently found one section of the honey-eaters (the *Melithrepti*) sitting upon eggs while still clothed in the brown dress of immaturity; and we know that such is the case with the introduced *Gallinaceæ* (or poultry), three or four generations of which have been often produced in the course of a year.

"Another peculiar feature connected with the Australian Ornithology is that of its comprising several forms endowed with the power of sustaining and enjoying life without a supply of water, that element without which most others languish and die; for instance, the halcyons, which I found sustaining life and breeding on the parched plains of the interior during the severe droughts of 1838-9, far removed from any water. The food of these birds is insects and lizards."*

When we bear in mind that Australia measures, in round numbers, about 3000 miles in length, that is, from east to west, and that, taking in Van-Dieman's Land, its breadth from north to south is nearly of the same extent, it may easily be supposed, in spite of vast tracts of uniform country, to present a considerable variety of physical structure and of climate, and a corresponding variety in the natural products of its different and distant parts. Van-Dieman's Land, from its smaller size and more southern position, is cooler and more humid than its mightier neighbour. The vegetation is abundant, the forests dense and difficult of access. New Holland, from its 25th to its 35th parallel, is much drier, and has a temperature which Mr. Gould supposes to be higher than that of any other portion of the world—the thermometer not unfrequently rising to 110°, 120°, and even 130° in the shade. Hot winds sweep over the country from the northward, indicating the dry and parched character of the

* Introduction, p. 15.

interior, and the falls of rain being uncertain and irregular, droughts of several months' continuance occur, during which the rivers, lakes, lagoons, are all dried up, and the earth becomes as a desolate wilderness.

"Pure element of waters! wheresoe'er
Thou dost forsake thy subterranean haunts,
Green herbs, bright flowers, and berry-bearing plants,
Rise into life, and in thy train appear :
And through the sunny portion of the year,
Swift insects shine, thy hovering pursuivants :
But if thy bounty fail, the forest pants,
And hart, and hind, and hunter with his spear,
Languish and droop together."

In New Holland such of the native creatures as possess extensive powers of locomotion, either remove to the mountains, where vegetation is less burnt up, or betake themselves to far off districts, while thousands of the less active or domesticated beings perish.

"At length," says Mr. Gould, "a change takes place, and rain falls abundantly, and the plains, on which but lately not a blade of herbage was to be seen, and over which the stillness of desolation reigned, become green with luxuriant vegetation. *Orchideæ*, and thousands of flowers of the loveliest hues, are profusely spread around, as if nature rejoiced in her renovation, and the grain springing up vigorously gives promise of an abundant harvest. This change from sterility to abundance in the vegetable world is accompanied by a correspondent increase of animal life—the waters become stocked with fish, the marshy districts with frogs and other reptiles; hosts of caterpillars and other insects make their appearance, and, spreading over the surface of the country, commence the work of devastation, which is, however, speedily checked by the birds of various kinds that follow in their train. Attracted by the abundance of food, hawks of three or four species, in flocks of hundreds, depart from their usual solitary habits, become gregarious and busy at the feast, and thousands of straw-necked Ibises, (*Ibis spinicollis*,) and other species of the feathered race, revel in the profusion of a welcome banquet."

As usual there is in New Holland a very direct relationship between the nature and extent of the general vegetation on the one hand, and the character and number of the feathered tribes on the other. It is, of course, chiefly in the vicinity of the few rivers which intersect the known parts of the country, and in the lower flats which receive the floods, that we find a more luxurious vegetation, and trees of gigantic growth. The stately Eucalypti, in particular, attain to a most enormous size. Mr. Backhouse measured one on the Lopham road, near Emeu Bay,

in Van-Dieman's Land, which, though rather hollow at the bottom and broken at the top, was 49 feet in circumference at nearly two yards from the ground. Another that was solid, and supposed to be 200 feet high, was 41 feet round. A third, calculated to be 250 feet in height, was 55½ round. As it spread much at the surface of the ground, it was there nearly 70 feet in circumference. A prostrate tree found near the junction of the Emeu River with the Loud water, was 35 feet in circumference at the base, 22 at a height of 66, and 19 at 110. It threw out a couple of large branches at the height of 120 feet, and its general head began to branch off at 150 feet. Its total length, as traced upon the ground, was 213 feet. A party of four abreast walked with ease along its trunk. In its fall it had upset an aspiring young neighbour, whose height had been 168 feet.

Great deltas are formed in New Holland, as elsewhere, by the descent of the interior rivers near their junction with the sea. Such is the Great Scrub, near the mouth of the Murray, an enormous flat of 100 miles in length, by above 20 in breadth, and clothed with a peculiar vegetation, dwarf *Eucalypti* forming a central belt, margined by shrub-like trees of various kinds. Immense belts of *Banksiæ* clothe the sand-hills of the sea-coast, and of some parts of the interior. Other districts are covered with grass-trees, (*Xanthorrhoeæ*), while the intertropical regions, so far as known of those almost *Terræ incognitæ*, produce, besides the *Eucalypti*, *Banksiæ*, and others of the southern coast, thick forests of canes, mangroves, &c. Now all these peculiar forest regions present an ornithology in a great measure peculiar to each. The *Banksiæ* are everywhere frequented by the true meliphagous or honey-sucking birds; the *Eucalypti* by the *Trichoglossi* and *Ptiloti*; the lofty fig-trees (so called) by the beautiful regent and satin birds; the palms by the *Carcophagæ*, or fruit-eating pigeons, and the verdurous plains by the ground pigeons and grass parrakeets. Perhaps the most remarkable fact of a negative nature connected with the distribution of New Holland birds, is the entire absence of the woodpecker tribe, a race which occurs in all parts of the world except Australia and the Polynesian Islands. Mr. Gould attributes this absence of the genus *Picus* to the fact, that the New Holland trees are destitute of a thick or corrugated bark. It is interesting to study the relationships and dependencies which may thus be so often traced among existing things, especially in those between which we do not at first perceive the likelihood of any natural connexion.

On analyzing Mr. Gould's great work on the Birds of Australia, containing, as we have said, 636 distinct species, it

will be found, when we re-arrange them in relation to their occurrence in certain great districts of the country, that 385 species inhabit New South Wales, 289 South Australia, 243 Western Australia, 230 Northern Australia, and 181 Van-Dieman's Land. Of these 88 are peculiar to New South Wales, 16 to South Australia, 36 to Western Australia, 105 to Northern Australia, and 32 to Van-Dieman's Land.

"The great excess," he observes, "in the number of species inhabiting New South Wales, is doubtless attributable to the singular belt of luxuriant vegetation, termed brushes, which stretches along the southern and south-eastern coasts, between the ranges and the sea, and which is tenanted by a fauna peculiarly its own. Although this part of the continent is inhabited by a larger number of species than any other, it is a remarkable fact, that the species peculiar to Northern Australia are much more numerous than those peculiar to New South Wales. It is curious to observe also, that while Southern Australia is inhabited by a much larger number of species than Western Australia, those peculiar to the former are not half so numerous as those peculiar to the latter. The more southern position, and consequently colder climate of Van-Dieman's Land, will readily account for the paucity of species found in that island."—*Introduction*, p. 134.

By the term *peculiar*, Mr. Gould does not desire to convey the notion that the species referred to are strictly or exclusively confined to the respective districts named, but merely that as yet they have not hitherto been discovered elsewhere.

We shall now notice a few of the more special features of Australian Ornithology. It will be remembered that so early in the history of New Holland as the days of Cook and Flinders, nests were observed of extraordinary magnitude. They were built upon the ground, rose to a height of two feet, were of great circumference, and very capacious in the centre. They were composed of branches and twigs of trees, and other materials, sufficient to fill a cart. Cook found one upon Eagle Island, on the east coast. Flinders fell in with another which contained residual masses resembling, though on a larger scale, the pellets of fur, and bones of mice, &c., disgorged by owls in England. They consisted in this part of the hair of seals and land animals, of the scaly feathers of the penguins, and the bones of other birds, and of small quadrupeds.

"Possibly," says Flinders, "the constructor of the nest might be an enormous owl, and if so, the cause of the bird being never seen, whilst the nests were not scarce, would be from its not going out until dark; but from the very open and exposed situations in which the nests were found, I should rather judge it to

be of the eagle kind, and that its powers are such as to render it heedless of any attempts of the natives upon its young."*

The Navigator was, in all probability, right regarding the group to which the bird belonged, although he took rather too much of a Sinbad-the-Sailor view of its supposed prowess or powers of resistance. It is now believed that these nests belong to the beautiful white-bellied sea-eagle, (*Haliastur leucogaster*,) by no means a ponderous species, nor requiring for itself and young so large a dwelling; but as these and several allied species continue to resort to the same eyry for a long succession of seasons, and carry fresh materials for re-construction and addition every year, it is easy to account for the eventual mass. Mr. Gould informs us that he found similar nests on rocks and promontories on islands in Bass's Straits, and took from them the young of *Hal. leucogaster*.

Only one species of buzzard has been discovered in New Holland—*Buteo melanosternon*. A curious anecdote regarding it was transmitted to Mr. Gould by his assistant, Mr. Gilbert. The bird is so bold, that when it discovers an emeu, an almost gigantic creature of the ostrich tribe, seated on her nest, it will attack her with such alarming ferocity as to drive her off. The hawk then takes up a stone between its talons, hovers with it in the air, lets it fall upon the eggs, to break their shell, and then descends to feed on their contents at leisure. Along our own shores we may every day observe the carrion and grey crows flying suddenly upwards high in air, each with a mussel in its bill, which it drops from its airy height upon a stone or rocky ledge below, so as to *smash* the shell and render its contents available. Knowing the latter fact to be true, we see no reason to doubt the former. In the one case the stone is made to fall upon the food, in the other the food is dropt upon the stone. In both the knowledge of cause and effect is much the same. Does this knowledge proceed from reason or instinct?

Several swifts and swallows are found in New Holland, all distinguished, as in Europe, by their almost never ceasing flight. A species with a peculiarly constructed tail (*Acanthylis caudacuta*) belongs to a group possessed of extraordinary powers of wing. It is a migratory bird in Australia, but from whence it comes and whither it goeth no man knows. A specimen was killed in England not many years ago, but why and by what route it came may be more easy to surmise than ascertain.

Among the *Halcyonidae*, or king-fisher family, (including the king-hunters of the forest and more central districts,) the genus *Dacelo* comprises the largest species, and forms one of the most

peculiar and conspicuous features of Australian ornithology. They are confined, however, to the south-eastern and northern provinces, the south-western possessing no species of the genus. Dr. Leichardt, in his "Journal," states, that when near the Gulph of Carpentaria, the "laughing jackass," as these birds are called, was of a different species (*Dacelo cervina*) from that of the eastern coast, being smaller in size, and "speaking a different language." Mr. Gould believes that these birds seldom or never drink, so their laughter cannot be supposed to proceed from any undue excitement. The allied genus *Halcyon* has many habits in common with *Dacelo*. The species "dwell, among other places, in the open plains, far away from water, and consequently must live for considerable periods without a supply of that element." The genus *Alcyon*, although found in New Guinea and the Indian islands, is more abundant in Australia than in any other country. The species differ from the preceding in frequenting the margins of rivers, where they prey on insects and small fish, and have much in common with the beautiful king-fisher of Europe, the type of the now restricted genus *Alcedo*.

Among the most extraordinary of the Australian birds, so far as concerns certain peculiar habits, are the *bower-birds*, so called from their constructing little galleries or covered ways for their own amusement and recreation, in no way connected with their nests. Those of the spotted bower-bird (*Chlamydera maculata*) are almost three feet long, constructed outwardly of twigs, and beautifully lined with tall grasses, so disposed that their points converge above. The most singular thing is, that these little harbours are profusely, if not richly, *decorated* in various ways, being strewed over with shells, the skulls of small quadrupeds, bones, and miscellaneous articles.

"I have frequently," observes our author, "found these structures at a considerable distance from the rivers, from the borders of which they could alone have procured these shells and small round pebbly stones; their collection and transportation must, therefore, have been a task of great labour and difficulty. As these birds feed almost entirely on seeds and fruits, the shells and bones cannot have been collected for any other purpose than ornament."*

The actual nest of this bird is very similar to that of the common thrush of Europe. It was found among the smaller branches of an acacia, overhanging a pool of water.

"I found matter of conjecture," says Captain Stokes, in relation to an allied species, "in noticing a number of twigs with their ends stuck in the ground, (which was strewed over with

shells,) and their tops brought together so as to form a small bower; this was two and a half feet long, one and a half foot wide at either end. It was not until my next visit to Port Essington that I thought this anything but some Australian mother's toy to amuse her child; there I was asked one day to go and see the 'birds' play-house,' when I immediately recognised the same kind of construction I had seen at the Victoria River; the bird (*Chlamydera nuchalis* of Mr. Gould) was amusing itself by flying backwards and forwards, taking a shell alternately from each side, and carrying it through the archway in its mouth."*

This building of a bower-like structure for a play-ground, or even, as it seems, assembly-hall, is practised by another cunning artificer of great beauty, called the satin bower-bird,—*Ptilonorhynchus holosericeus*. Its chamber is usually placed beneath the shade of some overhanging tree in the most retired recesses of the forest.

"The base consists of an extensive and rather convex platform of sticks firmly interwoven, in the centre of which the bower itself is built; this, like the platform on which it is placed, and with which it is interwoven, is formed of sticks and twigs, but of more slender and flexible description, the tips of the twigs being so arranged as to curve upwards and nearly meet at the top; in the interior of the bower the materials are so placed that the forks of the twigs are always presented outwards, by which arrangement not the slightest obstruction is offered to the passage of the bird. The interest of this curious bower is much enhanced by the manner in which it is decorated at and near the entrance with the most gaily coloured articles that can be collected, such as the blue tail-feathers of the rose-bill and Pennantian parrots, bleached bones, the shells of snails, &c. For what purpose these curious bowers are made is not yet perhaps fully understood; they are certainly not used as a nest, but as a place of resort for many individuals of both sexes, which, there assembled, run through and around the bower in a sportive manner, and that so frequently that it is seldom entirely deserted."—*Birds of Australia*, vol. iv. Plate 10.

Mr. Strange of Sydney, who kept a pair in his aviary, (they unfortunately died on the passage round Cape Horn, on their way to the late Earl of Derby,) where they neither bred nor built a nest, observed that they occupied themselves constantly for two months constructing bowers. The male is the principal workman; and our informant adds, "they are built for the express purpose of courting the female in."

The *Ptilinidae*, or parrot tribe, form a remarkable feature in the ornithology of New Holland. It was an odd notion of

* *Discoveries in Australia*, vol. ii. p. 97.

Buffon that no parrot occurred either northwards or southwards beyond the 25th degree on either side of the equator. He seems to have despised, as Pennant pointed out, the authority of the Dutch navigator Spilbergen, who found the woods full of them in the neighbourhood of Terra del Fuego, south latitude 54°. He might have called to mind the evidence of Commodore Byron, who says he saw them in countless flocks in the woods of Port Famine Harbour. They were observed by Captain Cook in New Zealand, by Captain Furneaux in Van-Dieman's Land. In our own days we find a North American species spreading beyond the river Illinois, to the vicinity of Lake Michigan, north latitude 42°. Parrots were seen by Alexander Wilson on the banks of the Ohio, in the month of February, flying through a snow storm in full rejoicing cry.

"No one group of birds," says Mr. Gould, "gives to Australia so tropical and foreign an air as the numerous species of this great family by which it is tenanted, each and all of which are individually very abundant. Immense flocks of white cockatoos are sometimes seen perched among the green foliage of the *Eucalypti*; the brilliant scarlet breasts of the kind called Rosehills, blaze forth from the yellow flowering *Acacia*; the *Trichoglossi* or honey-eating parrakeets, enliven the flowering branches of the *Eucalypti* with their beauty and their lively actions; the little grass parrakeets rise from the plains of the interior, and render these solitary spots a world of animation; nay, the very towns, particularly Hobart Town and Adelaide, are constantly visited by flights of this beautiful tribe of birds, which traverse the streets with arrow-like swiftness, and chase each other precisely after the manner the swifts are seen to do in our own islands. In the public roads of Van-Dieman's Land the beautiful *Platycerci* may be constantly seen in small companies, performing precisely the same office as the sparrows in England. I have also seen flocks of from fifty to a hundred, like tame pigeons at the barn-doors in the farm-yards of the settlers, to which they descend for the refuse grain thrown out with the straws by the thrashers. As might naturally be expected, the agriculturist is often sadly annoyed by the destruction certain species affect among his newly-sown and ripening corn, particularly where the land has been recently cleared, and is adjacent to the brushes."*

Fifty-five species of this great and sumptuous family are figured and described in Mr. Gould's larger work. These seem to constitute four principal groups, each comprising several genera, nearly the whole of which are strictly and peculiarly Australian. For example, neither *Calyptorhynchus*, *Platycercus*, *Euphema*, *Psephotus*, *Melopsittacus*, or *Nymphacus*, has been

found in any other region; and they are certainly elsewhere unsurpassed either in elegance of form or splendour of plumage.

Of the genus *Nestor* only two species are known,—one, *N. hypopolius*, confined to New Zealand,—the other, *N. productus*, an Australian kind. Both are somewhat peculiar looking parrots, with the point of the upper mandible greatly prolonged. They are supposed to be the remnants of a tribe, all the other members of which have perished, and of the two which remain it may be said that they are on the verge of extinction. The New Holland species has, indeed, a most singularly restricted range. It is known nowhere in the wide world except on Philip Island, the circumference of which is not more than five miles, scarcely larger than the lone St. Kilda.

“So strictly in fact,” says Mr. Gould, “is it confined to this isolated spot, that many persons who have resided in Norfolk Island for years, have assured me its occurrence there is never known, although the distance from one island to the other is not more than three or four miles. I regret to state, that in consequence of the settlement of Norfolk Island the native haunts of this fine bird have been so intruded upon, and such a war of extermination been carried on against it, that, if such be not the case already, the time is not far distant when the species will be completely extirpated, and, like the dodo, its skin and bones become the only mementoes of its existence.”

Mr. Gould has since informed us personally that this remarkable bird is now actually extinct as a wild species. A few which exist in confinement, as objects of curiosity, are all that survive, and as they do not breed in captivity, so soon as these cease to exist, the whole species will have perished. Little is known of their natural habits, but the shape and structure of the tongue are very peculiar, and a tame one seen at Sydney, instead of waddling in the awkward way peculiar to most parrots, leapt lightly like a crow. What a strange contrast is presented by the restricted distribution of this species, actually now confined to a few cages in Sydney, or elsewhere, and that of the turnstone, formerly referred to, which wings its unimpeded way in every region of the earth.

The *Columbidae* or pigeon tribe, are distributed over all the world, and exist in great force in Australia. We there find no less than 21 distinct species, many of them remarkable for brilliancy of colour, and a peculiar metallic lustre, which finely illustrates the beautiful expressions of Holy Scripture,—“as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.” The species of the genus *Phaps* are probably confined to Australia, but are more widely distributed over that vast region than any other section of the family, being found throughout the entire country, wherever the foot of man has


wandered and his eye observed. The most arid deserts of the interior are visited by them, if the smallest supply of water be within reach of their evening flight, "which is performed with the most extraordinary rapidity and power." Captain Sturt informs us, in relation to *Phaps histrionica*, that it collects in large flocks in March and April, living on the seed of the rice-grass, which the natives also collect for food, and that during the short period of that harvest, the flavour of its flesh is delicious. It flies to water at sunset, but only wets its bill; and it has often excited the wonder of the way-worn traveller that so small a supply should suffice to quench its thirst amid those burning plains.

"The numbers of this genus," adds Mr. Gould, "generally known by the name of bronze-wings, not only form an excellent viand for the settlers, but one of the greatest boons bestowed upon the explorer, since they not only furnish him with a supply of nutritious food, but direct him by their straight and arrow-like evening flight to the situations where he may find water, that element without which man cannot exist."—P. 79.

One of the most remarkable facts in the history of the pigeon tribe in general, is the extraordinary flocks in which certain species are sometimes found. Alexander Wilson calculated a flight of passenger pigeons (*Ectopistes migratoria*) which continued to pass above him for the greater portion of a day, to have been a mile in breadth, and 240 miles in length, and to have contained (three birds being assigned to every square yard) at least *two thousand two hundred and thirty million, two hundred and seventy-two thousand pigeons!* What a vast number of pies they would have made, and in these what consumption of flour and butter. The lamented Audubon in his delightful *Ornithological Biography* (vol. i. p. 319,) confirms the narration of his predecessor by a still more extraordinary statement; and he adds, that as every pigeon consumes fully half a pint of food, (chiefly mast,) the supply which *his* flock would have required must have amounted to *eight million seven hundred and twelve thousand bushels* per day. How hopeless to be a protectionist farmer in America!

The family called *Megapodidae* form a group more or less distributed over Australia, New Guinea, the Celebes, and the Philippine islands. Their history and habits are truly singular, and differ in several respects from those of all others of the feathered race. The three species which belong to New Holland are referable to three distinct genera, *Talegalla*, (containing the bird erroneously named New Holland vulture by the older authors,) *Leipoa*, and *Megapodius*. In their structure Mr. Gould regards them as most nearly allied to the *Gallinaceae*, although in some of their actions, and their mode of flight, they

greatly resemble the *Rallidæ*, and it is his opinion that the small size of their brain, coupled with the extraordinary means employed for the incubation of their eggs, "indicates an extremely low degree of organization." They have much in common with each other, and agree in the anomalous nature of their nidification. They all deposit their eggs in vast mounds of earth and leaves, constructed by themselves, and which become heated either by fermentation of the vegetable materials, or the sun's rays, so as to constitute a natural hot-bed, or forcing apparatus in which the eggs are hatched, and from which the young eventually emerge, in full feather, and capable of maintaining themselves (which many other bipeds do not do) by their own exertions from the first. An excellent account of the nest of one of these species, *Leipoa ocellata*, has been given by Sir George Grey—not the late Secretary for the Home Department—but the Governor of New Zealand, formerly of South Australia. We may mention that the bird referred to roosts at night on trees, runs with extraordinary rapidity, never flies when it can help it, and weighs (the male bird) about four pounds and a half.

"The mounds they construct," says Sir George, "are from twelve to thirteen yards in circumference at the base, and from two to three feet in height, the general form being that of a dome. The sand and grass are sometimes scraped up for a distance of from fifteen to sixteen feet from its outer edge. The mound appears to be constructed as follows:—A nearly circular hole, of about eighteen inches in diameter, is scratched in the ground, to the depth of seven or eight inches, and filled with dead leaves, and grass, and similar materials, and a large mass of the same substance is placed all round it on the ground. Over this first layer a large mound of sand, mixed with dried grass, &c., is thrown, and, finally, the whole assumes the form of a dome, as I have stated. When an egg is to be deposited, the top is laid open, and a hole is scraped in its centre, to within two or three inches of the bottom of the layer of dried leaves. The egg is placed in the sand, just at the edge of the hole, in a vertical position, with the smaller end downwards. The sand is then thrown in again, and the mound left in its original form. The egg which has thus been deposited is therefore completely surrounded and enveloped in soft sand, having from four to six inches of sand between the lower end of the egg and the layer of dried leaves. * When a second egg is laid, it is deposited in precisely the same plane as the first, but at the opposite side of the hole before alluded to. When a third egg is laid it is placed in the same plane as the others, but as it were at the third corner of a square. When the fourth egg is laid, it is still placed in the same plane; but in the fourth corner of the square, or rather of the lozenge, the figure, being of this form—; the next four eggs in succession are placed in

the interstices, but always in the same plane, so that at last there is a circle of eight eggs all standing upright in the sand, with several inches of sand intervening between each."

These singular mounds are usually found in sandy scrubby districts, but placed in some little open glade in the thickest part of the scrub. The eggs are of a pale pink colour, and so thin and fragile, that unless handled with the greatest care they break. All attempts to hatch them under domestic poultry have failed, by reason of brittleness.

Mr. Gilbert also describes these mound-shaped nests. The largest he saw was only in a state of preparation. It measured forty-five feet in circumference, and if moulded in proportion at the top, would have been fully five feet high. He adds that he found the white ants very numerous in these mounds, making their covered galleries all around, and even attached to the eggs themselves, thus disinterestedly preparing a sufficiency of food for the young bird, so soon as it emerges from the shell. Mr. Drummond, who was experienced in horticultural hot-beds, was of opinion that the central heat of these mounds was equal to 80°.

The allied species of the genus *Megapodius* construct their nests upon a similar principle, and of still more gigantic size. Mr. John Macgillivray, the observing son of an observant father, during the survey of Endeavour Straits, found three of their mounds in the small island of Nogo. The one which seemed most recent was placed on the crest of a hill, and measured eight feet in height, (thirteen and a half along the slope,) and seventy-seven feet in circumference. It was composed of well packed earth, stones, decaying leaves and branches, and other vegetable matter, with some living roots. After several hours' hard digging, fragments of eggs and a dead chick were found at a depth of six feet from the nearest surface. Another mound at the foot of the hill, and close upon the beach, measured not less than 150 feet in circumference; and to form this immense mass of materials, the birds had scraped the ground in the vicinity quite bare, and numerous shallow excavations shewed where they had been to quarry. It was of an irregular oval shape, the summit not being in the centre, but nearer the broader end, and fourteen feet high. Though inhabited by only a single pair of birds at a time, these nests are probably the work of several generations, being repaired and added to from season to season. To many people it seems as if there was much to do about nothing, but doubtless the birds know best.

We shall here take no note of those numerous, swift-running, and deep-wading tribes, which constitute the great order *Grallatores*.* Let us pass to a brief observance of the web-footed, or

* We have already, in our introductory observations, referred to the vast geographical expanse over which some of the species are dispersed.

swimming birds, strictly so called, (although many of the waders also swim like corks,) the order *Natatores*.

A comparative view of the various groups of the last named order, as inhabitants of Europe in the one hemisphere, and of New Holland in the other, exhibits some remarkable features. In each region there is both excess and deficiency of certain kinds, and we think that one important and valuable attribute of such correct and completed works as Mr. Gould's, viz., the "Birds of Europe," and the "Birds of New Holland," consists in their enabling us to institute such comparative views. No doubt we are much more perfectly acquainted with the former than with the latter, but still, we now in all probability possess sufficient samples, so to speak, of all the most important genera, even of the latter country, to enable us to stand on solid ground. The numerical results of this comparison, so far as concerns swimming birds, are as follows:—Of the true *Anatidæ*, or ducks, not counting mergansers, Europe possesses at least forty species, while only eighteen are known in Australia. Of the *Luridæ*, or gulls, twenty species dwell in Europe, while only three occur in Australia.* On the other hand, while Europe has only twelve species of terns, or sea-swallows, sixteen frequent the far Australian shores. Of the *Procellariidæ*, or petrels, very oceanic species, nearly forty are found on the Australian seas, while not more than seven are known to occur in those of Europe. Of the puffins and guillemots again, which so abound along many parts of our native and other northern shores, not a single species has ever been found in Australia, or indeed in any portion of the Southern ocean. On the other hand, penguins there abound, but are quite unknown in Europe. Grebes and cormorants are about equipoised in the two hemispheres.

The black swan, (*Cygnus atratus*), so long regarded as a "*rara avis in terris*," but now so frequent and well known, is a native of Australia, where it seems restricted to the southern districts. At least, it has never been observed in Torres Straits, or on any of the northern coasts. It is the only true swan found to the south of the Equator, the majority of the others occurring in the most northern parts of Europe and America.

A species of sooty tern occurs in vast abundance on Raine's Islet in May and June, as observed by a party employed to build the beacon there. About 1500 dozen of eggs were procured during the latter month, and great numbers of young birds were obtained for the pot. A mess of 22 men consumed on an average 50 every day, and supposing the convicts, about

* One of them is a skua gull, and is named *Larus catarractes* by Mr. Gould, as if it were identical with a European species, but this we believe is doubtful.

20 in number, to have eaten as many, 3000 birds must have been devoured in the "leafy month of June," yet so vast was the congregated body, that no sensible diminution in their numbers was perceptible. It is a grand sight to see an albatross (*Diomedea exulans*) either poised, as it were, almost motionless, high in air, itself more radiant than a summer cloud, or sweeping past upon unwearied wings, as if rejoicing when ruthless winds and waves "lift up their voices," and "ancient mariners" grow pale with fear. When full grown, this great sea-bird weighs from 17 to 20 pounds, and its "sail-broad vans" measure nearly twelve feet from tip to tip. It occurs along Van-Dieman's Land, and many of the Australian shores, except the northern parts. Unless during the breeding season, these birds, and the petrels, are found habitually spread over the wilderness of waters, entirely regardless of their distance, though it may be some thousand miles from land. Their powers of flight are excessive, their feet well webbed, and their bodies extremely buoyant. A racer is a vain thing for safety, compared with their swift and sure careering over sea and shore. Of the albatross there are nine known species, of which three frequent the North Pacific Ocean, and six the waters south of the Equator.

In the genus *Puffinus*, (bearing little or no relation to the *Puffins* of our northern seas,) are included certain kinds of petrels, of which one, *P. brevicaudatus*, is remarkable for the vast congregations in which it is sometimes seen. It is the kind referred to in the following extract from Flinder's Voyage:—

"There was a stream of from 50 to 80 yards in depth, and of 300 yards or more in breadth, the birds were not scattered, but were flying as compactly as a free movement of their wings seemed to allow; and during a full hour and a half, this stream of petrels continued to pass without interruption, at a rate little inferior to the swiftness of the pigeon. On the lowest computation, I think the number could not have been less than a hundred millions. Taking the stream to have been 50 yards deep, by 300 in width, and that it moved at the rate of 30 miles an hour, and allowing nine cubic yards of span to each bird, the number would amount to 151,500,000. The burrows required to lodge this quantity of birds would be 75,750,000; and allowing a square yard to each burrow, they would cover something more than 18½ geographical square miles."*

The tropic bird, so interesting to all who voyage across the equatorial seas, and the silvery lustre of whose plumage renders it, though almost colourless, one of the most beautiful of the feathered race, is represented in Australia by the more southern

form of *Phaeton phœnicurus*, distinguished by the red colour of the central line of the elongated tail feathers. It breeds in Norfolk Island, and elsewhere.

The *Pelicans* are widely dispersed over the watery world, every great region of the earth, not altogether northern, having one or more species. The Australian kind, *Pel. conspicillatus*, is a large and sumptuous looking creature. Of the cormorants, a nearly allied tribe, though of a darker and more sinister aspect, we find no less than five different species in the country now under consideration. When Milton placed the first Tempter in Paradise, in likeness of a cormorant *perched on a tree*, he was criticised, though falsely, for having raised a web-footed bird to such arboreal height. But the immortal poet was correct, as cormorants of certain kinds, and he was free to choose, are often seen on trees. The greatest of our modern minstrels, in his autobiography, while describing a renowned seat of learning, not as it was, but as he deemed it might have been, presents us with many solemn and tranquillizing images and trains of thought:—

“This truth escaped me not, and I confess,
That having 'mid my native hills given loose
To a school-boy's vision, I had raised a pile
Upon the basis of the coming time,
That fell in ruins round me. Oh, what joy
To see a sanctuary for our country's youth
Informed with such a spirit as might be
Its own protection; a primeval grove,
Where, though the shades with cheerfulness were filled,
Nor indigent of songs warbled from crowds
In under-coverts, yet the countenance
Of the whole place should bear a stamp of awe;
A habitation sober and demure
For ruminating creatures; a domain
For quiet things to wander in; a haunt
In which the heron should delight to feed
By the shy rivers, and the pelican
Upon the cypress spire, in lonely thought
Might sit and sun himself.—Alas! alas!
In vain for such solemnity I looked.”*

The picture is striking and suggestive. How beautiful the contrast between the rich creamy white of the pelican's immaculate garment, and the dark funereal hue of the melancholy cypress!

“Like fir-tree bough
To which on some unruffled morning clings,
A flaky weight of winter's purest snow.”

We believe the renowned Laker, like his great predecessor, is ornithologically right in his selection of the pelican as being, though a web-footed, yet a perching bird, as it does occasionally roost on trees; but as it never ventures so far west as Britain, it can scarcely be regarded as an appropriate emblem of intellectual tranquillity and repose on the banks of the Cam. The ornithologist, at least, can find it in neither field nor forest in any part of Western Europe:—

“Alas! Alas!

In vain for such solemnity he looks.”

We shall conclude our fragmentary sketch of the Australian birds with the penguins, (*Spheniscidae*), a most peculiar group, characteristic of the southern seas. Van-Dieman's Land and the islands in Bass's Straits are their principal resorts during the breeding season. Tons of dead birds of the penguin kind are elsewhere dug up by our seamen from a considerable depth while collecting guano, from which it is inferred that they are the principal producers of that novel and now valuable agricultural ingredient, and that it has a preservative effect on animal substances, from the recognisable condition in which, after a long entombment, the birds are found. A Portuguese sailor was extracted lately, looking remarkably well. He is supposed to have lain for a greater number of years imbedded in the guano, than he had previously spent upon the surface of the earth.

We shall now turn our steps homewards, to take into consideration a few of the ornithological relationships which exist between our own country and the sister isle. Although above sixty more species of birds have been found in Great Britain than in Ireland, the majority of the excess is occasioned by continental stragglers, which are either blown out of their intended way, or take the nearer island temporarily in the course of their natural migratory movements. Although many species, as we have already seen, are widely spread, yet there is such a thing as a system of geographical distribution, or rather restriction, most species having what may be called a central region where they most abound, and beyond which they become scarce, and finally disappear. The western shores of continental Europe form almost the extreme boundary of many species, that is, they have become scarce even in districts not upon the actual coast. In regard to these their occurrence in Britain is unfrequent, if not accidental; they are found, if at all, along our eastern shores, and are either still more rare in Ireland, or totally unknown. It is therefore the remoteness of our islands from the geographical centre of several European species to which we owe their absence, rather than to anything in the physical structure or

climatic character of these islands. It is thus that the ptarmigan, (*Tetrao lagopus*), a species abundant in Scandinavia and the central Alps of Europe, has certain outlying flocks in Scotland and the Hebrides, but is unknown in Ireland. Its occurrence in the island of Jura, which though mountainous is not Alpine, and in Islay, which is scarcely even mountainous, shews that its absence from Ireland is not owing to want of elevation, for the "Green Isle" has loftier ranges than those of Jura, and possesses also those granitic and schistose summits on which the ptarmigan delights to dwell. The black-cock, (*Tetrao tetrix*), which abounds over a great portion of central Europe, becomes less frequent as we travel westward, and has never got further in that direction than Britain, and a few of its nearer islands, where, however, several circumstances (at least in Scotland) seem in later years to have favoured its preservation and increase.

So also in regard to birds of passage, or summer migrants. These are influenced in their movements by an instinct which takes them in spring from south to north, in autumn from north to south. The great mass are bred in temperate or northern countries, which are warm in summer, but from a peculiarity of constitution, certain species cannot stand the cold which, during winter, falls upon the regions of their birth, and so they migrate southwards to avoid it. There is, however, no essential or specific difference, in many cases, between permanent and migratory birds, many *individuals* among the latter being stationary, that is, never travel northwards at all. Indeed, not a few species are known to be permanent in one country, and birds of passage in another. Their migratory habits, therefore, depend, in some measure, on the places of their birth, and the necessity under which they may be placed of withdrawing from the winter's cold. Thus several birds are migratory in Scandinavia and the arctic regions of America, which are not so in Britain, owing to the comparative mildness of our "sea-girt isle."

It is a distinctly ascertained fact, that many European birds winter in the north of Africa. Voyagers from the Straits of Gibraltar to Italy, Greece, and Turkey, have had frequent and prolonged opportunities of observing these migrations both in spring and autumn, and the great flights of quails, and their few days' sojourn on certain islands of the Mediterranean *en route* northwards, are well known. Now, as this migratory impulse is from north to south, or *vice versa*, and not from east to west, or the contrary—that is, as the latitude is always greatly changed, but seldom or much less the longitude, it is easy to perceive that the principal stream of migratory species flowing northwards in spring from the southern shores of the Mediterranean, will not strike upon Britain, which lies too far to the

westward. If a falcon were to leave Algiers and wing its way northwards, it would miss our South Foreland, and have but little chance of picking up a Norfolk pout. But such migratory species, or individuals of those species, as travel by Spain and over the western provinces of France, naturally arrive on the British Islands,—a greater number of them in Britain than in Ireland, and a larger proportion in the south-eastern counties of England than elsewhere. It is thus that the nightingale, and some other summer songsters, so frequent in the eastern counties of the south of England, are rare in Devonshire, never heard in Wales, and quite unknown in Ireland. Thus the preponderance of British over Irish species is no doubt owing to Great Britain, and especially the southern portion of England, having a more eastern position. The same cause assigns to Sweden several remarkable southern or summer migrants, such as the hoopoe, (*Upupa epops*), quite unknown to Britain, except as casual visitants, few and far between. We may add, that while England has several southern species which do not cross our borders, Scotland has several northern ones, (among the ducks and divers,) which, though only winter birds in England, never leave us, but abide and breed among our northern lakes and marshes throughout the summer.

It must be evident to all who are interested in the geographical distribution of species, that an accurate knowledge of the ornithology of Ireland is of great importance. It is the “Ultima Thule” of Europe on the west, and the first piece of terra firma on which any American species, some of which occasionally cross the Atlantic, can set its foot. The mildness of its climate has some influence on its birds. Certain land species, which, as British birds, are found during winter in only the extreme south of England, occur familiarly in the north of Ireland all the year round. The moisture as well as mildness of the climate, and the extent of bog, which is admitted to be rather considerable in Ireland, causes the assemblage in winter of several species of Grallatorial and other birds in much greater numbers than in Britain. Were Ireland joined to Britain it would probably gain a few additions of such species as frequent our western districts, and have gone no further. But it would not gain the nightingale, which, in the existing state of things, does not visit Wales or the western coasts of England. Neither would it gain that species of stock-dove called *Columba oenas*, a resident forest species, which does not range further westward than the midland counties of England, and is still unknown in any part of Scotland. Ireland has no resident bird belonging to itself, or different from those of Britain; and Britain and Ireland conjoined have only one species peculiar to themselves—the red-grouse, or moor-fowl, (*Tetrao Scoticus*), which is known

nowhere else throughout the world, and affords one of the most singular examples of restricted distribution with which naturalists are acquainted.*

With the exception just named, Great Britain and Ireland, then, may be said to belong ornithologically to the continent of Europe. If another island existed beyond Ireland, which fortunately, for many reasons, is not the case, the species there would be still fewer, because the further we remove from one centre of distribution without entering into another, the numbers decrease, and this decrease is accelerated by *insulation*. But if a great western world like America was close at hand, which also fortunately, for an equal number of reasons, is not the case, both Ireland and the imaginary island beyond it would become more affluent in their ornithology, because in the event supposed, while they would still be near the circumference of their own great eastern circle of distribution, they would have also entered within the range of a western one, and thus gain an accession of species. When we talk of centres and circles of distribution, it must be understood that these terms are not intended to signify that each circle or range is distinct in itself, and different from its neighbours, far and near. On the contrary, there is, though a continual yet a gradual change of species, a new one ever and anon appearing as an old one disappears, so that each great country, if not altogether apart or extremely remote from any neighbour, contains much in common with some other country on either side, as well as something peculiar to and characteristic of itself. The circle of each great group is variously intersected by portions of circles of other contiguous groups. A zoological centre and circle may in fact be likened, in some measure, to those which a traveller on the face of the earth forms and sees around him. As he advances on his way, the component parts of the scene are changing step by step, but still he continues ever the centre of his own fair sphere, surrounded by a circle varying by such slow and slight gradations, that he scarcely apprehends the change, except by a recalling and comparison of distant parts. Every man, not being a collier, sees a horizon every day; but we presume that the most powerful of pedestrians never stepped on one, and probably never will, so long at least as the world continues round. Yet what is one man's centre is only a portion of another man's circle,—and so it is in ornithology. Species, rare towards their outer range, become common as we advance into their centre of dominion, while others which were previously common, on the same principle become extremely scarce, and soon

* It is usually regarded as the most singular; but the existence of a peculiar parrot (*Nestor productus*) being confined, as already mentioned, to Philip Island, is equally curious and unaccountable.

afterwards seem to vanish from the earth. The one set has entered within, the other has passed beyond the ornithological horizon.

We shall now point out the more remarkable distinctive peculiarities, in respect to their feathered inhabitants, of Great Britain and Ireland, taking up the subject, though slightly, yet in systematic order. But as an introduction to the Emerald Isle, we shall first quote the following interesting passage from Mr. Thompson's valuable work, in illustration of the effect produced on birds, not apparently under man's dominion, by the industrial operations of the human race.

"I have remarked this particularly at one locality near Belfast, situated 500 feet above the sea, and backed by hills rising to 800 feet. Marshy ground, the abode of little else than the snipe, became drained, and that species was consequently expelled. As cultivation advanced, the numerous species of small birds attendant upon it, became visitors, and plantations soon made them inhabitants of the place. The land-rail soon haunted the meadows, the quail and the partridge the fields of grain. A pond, covering less than an acre of ground, tempted annually for the first few years, a pair of the graceful and handsome sandpipers, (*Totanus hypoleucos*,) which with their brood, appeared at the end of July or beginning of August, on their way to the seaside from their breeding haunt. This was in a moor about a mile distant, where a pair annually bred until driven away by drainage rendering it unsuitable. The pond was supplied by streams descending from the mountains through wild and rocky glens, the favourite haunt of the water-ouzel, which visited its margin daily throughout the year. When the willows planted at the water's-edge had attained a goodly size, the splendid king-fisher occasionally visited it during autumn. Rarely do the water-ouzel and king-fisher meet 'to drink at the same pool;' but here they did so. So soon as there was sufficient cover for the water-hen, (*Gallinula chloropus*,) it, an unbidden but most welcome guest, appeared and took up its permanent abode; a number of them frequently joining the poultry in the farm-yard at their repast. The heron, as if conscious that his deeds rendered him unwelcome, stealthily raised his 'blue bulk' aloft, and fled at our approach. The innocent and attractive wagtails, both pied and grey, were of course always to be seen about the pond. A couple of wild-ducks, and two or three teal, occasionally at different seasons, became visitants; and once, early, in October, a tufted duck (*Fuligula cristata*) arrived, and after remaining a few days, took its departure, but returned in company with two or three others of the same species. These went off several times, but returned on each occasion with an increase to their numbers, until above a dozen adorned the water with their presence. During severe frost, the woodcock was driven to the unfrozen rill dripping into it beneath a dense mass of foliage; and the snipe, together with the jack-snipe, appeared along the edge of the water. The titlark, too, visited it at such times. In summer, the swallow, house-martin, sand-martin,

and swift, displayed their respective modes of flight in pursuit of prey above the surface of the pond. The sedge-warbler poured forth his imitative or mocking notes from the cover on the banks, as did the willow-wren its simple song. This bird was constantly to be seen ascending the branches and twigs of the willows (*Salix viminalis* chiefly) that overhung the water, for *Aphides* and other insect prey. In winter lesser redpoles in little flocks were swayed gracefully about, while extracting food from the light and pendent branches of the alder-seed. Three species of tit (*Parus major*, *cæruleus* and *ater*,) and the gold-crested *regulus*, appeared in lively and varied attitudes on the larch and other trees. In winter, also, and especially during frost, the wren and the hedge-accentor were sure to be seen threading their modest way among the entangled roots of the trees and brushwood, little elevated above the surface of the water.

“ So far only, the pond and bordering foliage have been considered ; many other species might be named as seen upon the trees. On the banks a few yards distant, fine Portugal laurels tempted the greenfinch to take up its permanent residence, and served as a roost during the winter for many hundred linnets, which made known the place of their choice by congregating in some fine tall poplars that towered above the shrubs, and thence poured forth their evening jubilee.

“ To name all the birds that cultivation, the erection of houses, the plantation of trees and shrubs, together with the attraction of a garden, brought to the place, would be tedious. It will therefore only be further observed, that the beautiful goldfinch, so long as a neighbouring hill-side was covered with thistles and other plants on the seeds of which it fed, visited the standard cherry trees to nidify ; and the spotted flycatcher, which particularly delights in pleasure-grounds and gardens, annually spent the summer there. Of the six species of British *Merulidæ*, the resident missel and song-thrushes, and the blackbird inhabited the place ; the fieldfare and redwing, winter visitants, were to be seen in their season : and the ring-ouzel annually during summer frequented an adjacent rocky glen. Curlews on their way from the sea to the mountain moor, occasionally alighted on the pasture fields. The entire number of species seen at this place (seventy-five English acres in extent) was seventy ; forty-one or forty-two of which bred there. A few others,—the kestrel, ring-ouzel, sand-martin, and quail, built in the immediate neighbourhood.”—*Birds of Ireland*, Preface to vol. i. p. 11.

That the planting of shrubs and trees, and the general operations of horticulture, tend to increase the number of birds is certain. Nearly seventy different species have been counted in Kensington Gardens. Rooks are often seen to settle in ancient groves, where they were formerly unknown, soon after villages or groups of houses have been erected in their neighbourhood. They frequently take up their abode on trees which, in consequence of the extension of towns, have become surrounded by the dwellings of man, and swallows, sparrows, thrushes, blackbirds, redbreasts, wrens, all desire to build their nests upon our houses.

Of the great raptorial order or birds of prey, (*Accipitres*,) Ireland seems to possess her full share, all the truly British eagles, falcons, hawks, buzzards, kites, and owls, being found within her shores, although a few stray species, such as the swallow-tailed kite, (*Elanus furcatus*,) the Egyptian vulture, (*Neophron percnopterus*,) and several continental owls, (of casual occurrence in Britain,) have not as yet been seen there. On the other hand, the griffon vulture (*Vultur fulvus*) and the spotted eagle (*Aquila navia*) have occurred in Ireland, and are unknown in England. The latter is supposed to have been seen in Skye. It is an inhabitant of the south and east of Europe. The common kite (*Falco milvus*) is very rare in Ireland.

Mr. Thompson gives us some curious particulars regarding that fine species, the golden eagle. A sporting friend assured him that when hunting among the Belfast mountains, one of those birds was seen soaring above the hounds "as they came to fault after a good chase." As they gained the scent again, and were going at full cry, the eagle swooped down at a distance of three or four hundred yards in advance, and carried off the hare. In most works on Ornithology the golden eagle is characterized as indocile. But Mr. Langtry of Fort-William, near Belfast, had some years ago a bird which was extremely tractable. It was, to be sure, a Scotch specimen, which may perhaps account for it. It became at once attached to its owner, and after a month's confinement was restored to liberty and the use of its wings, but so far from abusing that liberty in the way of making off, it was found to return to the lure whenever called.

"As one of the first steps toward straining this eagle for the chase, it was hooded after the manner of a hunting hawk; but the practice was soon abandoned as unnecessary, in consequence of its remaining quiet and contented when carried on the arm of its master. It was unwilling indeed to leave him even to take a flight, unless some special 'quarry' was in view. When at liberty for the day, and my friend appeared in sight at any distance, his arm was no sooner held out towards the affectionate bird, than it came hurriedly flying to perch upon it. I have, when in his company—for it was indifferent to the presence of strangers—seen it fly to him without any food being offered, not less than a dozen times within half an hour. When on the ground, and the lure was thrown comparatively near, this bird preferred running—which it could do very fast—to using its wings. It was also fed from the 'fist.' Live rats were several times turned out of the cage-trap to it, but before getting far away they were invariably pounced upon. Four full-grown rats have been taken at a meal; an entire heron, (*Ardea cinerea*), except the head and legs, was also eaten on one occasion. It differed somewhat in its manner of feeding from two sea eagles which were kept along with it; when the head and neck of a goose were offered, the golden eagle ate them wholly; the latter took the flesh off only, leaving the harder parts; and when entire birds were given,

the sea eagle plucked many more feathers off than the golden,* the latter assimilating to the peregrine falcon in this respect. This golden eagle was more partial to alighting on trees than the sea eagles were. Flying from one group of them to another, it in this manner followed its master about the demesne, indolently remaining as long as possible where it perched, consistently with keeping him in sight. My friend discontinued any further training of this eagle, on account of its boldness, as it flew not only at well-grown cygnets of the tame swans, but at the old birds themselves, which were obliged to take to the water for safety: it also flew at dogs."—Vol. i. p. 10.

One of the largest eagle cages, (next to that of Mr. John Gregory, of Canaan Lodge, near Edinburgh,) of which we have chanced to hear, is that in the Phoenix Park, Dublin. It was erected at the expense of Sir Philip Crampton, Bart., as a place of recreation for the larger carnivorous quadrupeds, but entirely failed in its intended purpose. When a tigress was placed in this expanded den, (thirty-six feet long, sixteen broad, sixteen high,) she quailed and trembled, and seemed most anxious to regain the confined shelter of her usual berth. A lioness and leopard would not enter it voluntarily, but had to be forced to play themselves. Soon after (of course in absence of the *Felinæ*), seven eagles were placed in it, and were found to dwell together in amity. Various additions of the same kind were made from year to year, until at last (1845) the number of eagles placed in company amounted to seventeen—viz., three golden, two white-headed, and twelve sea eagles. They lived together, if not in heartfelt harmony, at least with an outward show of respect towards each other. Only one serious quarrel took place. A sea eagle pounced upon a golden one. The latter threw itself upon its back, when the former, with its talons, seized it by the legs, which made it almost faint with fear or pain, while the assailant gave forth a loud triumphant cry.

"I had some difficulty," says Mr. R. Ball, "in beating the bird off the other with a pole; it was removed from the cage, and shortly afterwards accidentally killed. On another occasion, a golden eagle was found drowned in the bath, or large trough, in which eagles delight to roll; it was supposed by the keeper to have been forced under water by one of the sea eagles, but more probably it got cramped, as the birds seem often to carry their bathing to excess. It is a remarkable fact, that a sea eagle but one year old seemed to be generally acknowledged as the superior of the whole. This bird seized the first piece of food thrown into the cage as its acknowledged right; but should any other eagle happen to get possession of it, the food was instantly given up on the approach of the young one, which, when full grown, was about the largest of the flock. The bathing of

* * Birds up to the size of sparrows are eaten whole by the golden eagle; three sparrows have been taken in succession without a feather being plucked off."

eagles alluded to is remarkable. On observing that these birds, which in menageries are generally kept without water, exhibited a great desire to wash themselves, a large vessel was provided. When fresh water is put into this vessel, it is at once occupied by one of them, and surrounded by the others waiting their turn for a dip; they eventually lie in it for some time, until completely wetted."

Mr. Gregory's golden eagles, (a fine pair from the Lake of Killarney,) from which the *Felinae* are *not* debarred, are in truth very fond of live cats. The female makes the first pounce, and usually eats about one half, leaving the other for her mate, who waits patiently till his time comes. The victim is first transfixed by the talons, near the upper portion of the spine, while the neck or throat is almost simultaneously pierced by the bill. Death is often nearly instantaneous, or extremely speedy—occasionally more prolonged, much depending on the success of the first pounce, something on the prowess and activity of the individual *Felis*.*

In relation to the smaller accipitrine birds, we may state that the merlin (*Falco æsalon*) is indigenous in both the north and south of Ireland. It breeds upon the ground, generally in wild and moorland districts, and although not a bird of passage, it ranges with the season, being more frequent in lowland cultivated counties in winter than in summer. We once saw it dart from the centre of a large silver fir-tree, near Stranraer, in the month of July, and presumed it had there and then its nest; but as the general opinion seems to be of one accord, that it always builds upon the ground, our arboreal exception may have been merely resting itself after a flight. We have never chanced to see this species hovering after the mode so beautifully described by the Ettrick Shepherd,—

"And the merlin hung in the middle air,
With his little wings outspread,
As if let down from the heavens there
By a viewless silken thread."

It may be that the well-known "windhover," commonly called the kestrel, (*Falco tinnunculus*), is here meant, though misnamed. Many errors of this kind creep into poetry, where a dreamy rather than discriminate view is sometimes taken of the actualities

* Mr. Gregory's golden eagles have been frequently observed to swallow small birds entire, without plucking—quite in accordance with what is mentioned by Mr. Thompson in the preceding note. An Irish bird-trapper, much employed by Mr. G., (both for *Felinae* and fowls of the air,) gave them more than once a stink of green linnets, which they snapped up and swallowed, feathers and all, each at a single, almost instantaneous, mouthful. A soft-hearted ornithologist, on a certain occasion, remonstrated with the son of Erin as to the possible cruelty of thus feeding the eagles with living linnets. "And is it bad for the eagles? please your honour," he immediately replied, in great alarm. Here the conversation was allowed to drop;

"The force of nature could no further go."

of nature, and so fact and fiction become blended into a peculiar and delusive *tertium quid*, which is neither one nor other. In all our ballad poetry there is perpetual reference to the *Goshawk*, a species which is not historically known in our border countries, which has never been seen to breed there in modern times, and was no doubt substituted by the minstrels in room of the more frequent peregrine.

The kestrel, already named, though well known in Ireland, is much less numerous there than in Britain. This is supposed to be in some measure accounted for by the well-known fact, that there are no field-mice (*Arvicolæ*) in Ireland, and very few shrews.* These small mammalia form the favourite food of the kestrel, which, however, preys also on insects, lizards, and little birds. Some naturalists deny that it attacks birds at all, but that it does so is certain. Mr. Garrett states, that the ivy-covered gable of his house, near Belfast, tenanted by numerous sparrows, was almost daily visited at sunset by a kestrel, which always captured and carried off a bird from among the congregated roosters. However, on examining the interior of this species, it will generally be found to contain the debris of beetles. It has been seen hawking for cock-chafers towards evening, and preying upon them in the air (from hand to mouth) without alighting.

There is no distinct proof that the true goshawk (*Falco palumbarius*) has been ever seen in Ireland. As a European species it is widely spread, but the American bird, (*Falco atricapillus*), though closely allied, is representative rather than identical. As a breeding bird the goshawk is certainly not now a British species, though stray examples are sometimes met with.

The generality of our British Owls are found in Ireland; but our common brown species (*Strix stridula*) is scarcely known there. It is also extremely rare in the north of Scotland. The most beautiful, and one of the largest birds of this group, the great snowy-owl (*Strix nyctea*) of Iceland and the Arctic regions, occurs occasionally in Ireland, although less frequently than in Shetland and the north of Lewis. The discovery of the breeding place of this fine species, is a point well worthy of being attempted by the ornithologists of the rising generation. It is not seldom seen in the Island of Unst, the most northern pendicle of the British kingdom, and nearly half-a-dozen specimens were obtained in the neighbourhood of the Butt of Lewis, during the summer of 1850. Several were also killed in Caith-

* Among the British quadrupeds, we may here note, that the pole-cat, squirrel, dormouse, and mole, are all unknown in Ireland. Even our common hare (*Lepus timidus*) is absent, being represented by a peculiar Irish species not found in Britain, *Lepus Hibernicus*. The species of bats in Ireland are very few compared with those of Britain, especially of England.

ness. Their nests have never been discovered. The notion entertained by some of the natives (of Lewis), with whom we conversed upon the subject, was, that these birds build there on stony islets in the midst of moorland lochs—situations certainly of great security, as there are now no boats on those upland waters. We examined several specimens, and found them well-conditioned, fully feathered birds, but from the great prevalence of dusky spots and bars, they were probably “two year olds.” We are not aware that a perfectly mature specimen, that is, with the plumage of a pure white, with distinct dark-coloured markings, has ever been found among us till the conclusion of the breeding season, in which case they may have formed only a portion of the winter migration from the far north. This species frequently hunts by day, as indeed all Arctic owls must necessarily do, being inhabitants of countries where a “sleepless summer of long light” knows nothing of the gloom of our nocturnal darkness. Besides its love of hares, (from whence its Swedish name of *Hår-fång*,) rabbits, and feathered game, it is a very dexterous fisher, sailing over the placid waters as soft and silent as a wreath of snow, but striking from time to time its talons through the back of unsuspecting fish, and bearing it off to craggy knoll or leafy arbour. It has been remarked that there are few things more completely out of place than a trout on the top of a tall tree.

Owls in general are supposed to be very useful in preventing the increase of the smaller quadrupeds, (Mr. Ball took nine mice from the stomach of a single bird,) and on this account are in many places held in high esteem. A white owl is regarded as sacred in Arabia, because when Mahomet, pursued by his enemies, was on the point of being discovered in a cave where he had taken refuge, one of these birds flew from it, and his assailants immediately returned upon their steps, concluding that no one could have previously entered it. But so far from being deemed sacred, they are *eaten* in Norfolk, where the people, even in a land of turkeys, have a saying, “as tender as a boiled owl.”

We shall next take a brief survey of a few of the Insectorial or perching birds, among which are included all our smaller land-birds and songsters, as well as crows, pies, &c.

Of the shrikes, the red-backed species, (*Lanius collurio*,) common in all the southern and western counties of England, and well known in Wales, has not yet made its way to Ireland. At this we rather wonder, as it is a bird of buoyant wing.

That delightful bird, the dipper, or water-ouzel, (*Cinclus aquaticus*,) which forms so familiar and enlivening a feature of our rocky streams and torrents, is common over Ireland, as in Britain, wherever suitable localities occur. During winter many

migrate to the lakes and lower streams, but they are most abundant in the breeding season among the upland tributaries. We have never seen them perch on trees, although Mr. Thompson says they do so.

"About the ponds at Wolf-hill, an elevated situation near Belfast, where these birds have chiefly come under my observation, the willows that fringe the bank are, owing to the absence of stones, their constant perch. Contiguous to these ponds are rocky mountain streams, by which they are supplied. The water-ouzel is described by Montagu and Selby merely as a very early songster. In the north of Ireland its song is occasionally heard at all seasons; and more especially when other birds are silent, as in the autumnal, and still more frequently the winter months. The bright mornings and forenoons that occur during the most severe frost and snow, have always seemed to me its favourite time for song, which it pours forth when quickly flying at a great height, as well as when perched just above the water."—Vol. i. p. 116.

Although associated in our own mind with the most lonely places,—secluded upland vales, encompassed by the "pastoral melancholy" of the green mountains, the dipper is often seen along the umbrageous banks of larger rivers, where, with a darker back-ground, its pure white breast shines like a little ball of snow. Neither is it shy of human neighbourhood, as well observed by Sir William Jardine.

"If civilisation has encroached on its retreats, and machinery or mills have been in consequence erected, it accommodates itself to the change, loses its secluded habits, and seems even to enjoy the bustle. It may often be seen perched on the inner spokes of the mill-wheel, singing its lowly song; and we have known it breed within the passage of the torrent which drove it. In such places they live in pairs, each having, as it were, a locality or limit within which they range, and where they select an appropriate situation for the nest. When about to alight, they usually drop or splash into the pools or streams, and seldom settle at once upon the stones or rocks. They are among our most pleasing songsters, although, from the lowness of their notes, not often heard; but to the angler who plies his rod at all hours, and in the most sequestered places, it is a well-known and welcome strain. It may be heard during the whole year, but spring and the breeding season are the periods when it may be most frequently enjoyed. Being early breeders, this sign of the coming year is often heard in February, while the streams are still bound up in ice; and a clear and shining morning at this early time, will be sure to display some of those cleanly songsters perched on a prominent stone or stick, or on the edge of a frozen pool, warbling their notes just audible above the murmurs of the stream. Their breeding-places are chosen close

to the brook or river, and often in curious situations. The nest is generally constructed under some brow or overhanging rock, or among the matted roots of a tree; at other times under some fall, which is projected over a space, hollow and comparatively dry within, or beneath the dam or weir which serves to turn off the water to supply the mill; and we have once or twice observed it under the very sluice of the wheel. In the latter situation the parent bird dashes through the face of the rushing waters when about to enter the nest, and seems to enjoy the act, entering and retreating two or three times before commencing her seat.*

Sir William Jardine adds, that the practice of perching on the neighbouring willows, as mentioned by Mr. Thompson, is unusual, even in valleys fringed with wood. A stem, or fallen branch arrested in the stream, may be sought for, but he has never seen them inclined to perch upon the overhanging or adjoining branches, and refers their doing so to something special in the place. The food of the dipper is aquatic larvæ, and occasionally sticklebacks, and other small fishes. We know of no proof that the ova of salmon form its favourite food. It is greatly persecuted in the north of Scotland, on account of its supposed depredations among the spawning beds, and we formerly received an authenticated report from a factor of the Duke of Sutherland's, that 548 dippers had been purposely destroyed in a single Highland district during a period of three years. Whatever may have caused the decrease of salmon, we hold the water-ouzel less blamable than the water-bailiff, although even he may be sometimes more sinned against than sinning.

A peculiar habit of the dipper, and one from which it no doubt has obtained both its name and opprobrious character, as a poacher, consists in its sinking or walking into the water, and then proceeding to search for insect food among the submerged stones and gravel. "The assertion," says Mr. Yarrell, "of its walking below the water, which some persons have ventured, is not made good by observation, nor countenanced by reason." We infer that this bird is rare in the south of England, else so observant an ornithologist would, in the course of his inquiries, have had the ocular proof. It is curious that a bird so abundant in the north of Scotland should not have made its way into the Orkney and Shetland Islands. We are not sure that it is even a Hebridean native. We know not why Acerbi should allege that it is not an Italian species, although he gives no better authority than his own for a statement which is not a fact.†

* *Naturalist's Library. Ornithology. Vol. xi. p. 87.*

† "I torrenti de' monti alti," says Professor Savi, "che han sempre a que lim-

We shall conclude our notice of this species, which is *par excellence* the angler's bird, being often for many an hour the only one he either sees or hears, with a brief record of our last encounter with it. While angling from a boat on Loch Tummel, at a considerable distance from the shore, an unexpected water-ouzel flew suddenly beneath our outstretched rod, and then precipitately tumbled into the water, and disappeared from view. Almost simultaneously a momentary rushing sound was heard through the still air, so close at hand as almost to be felt, and a large peregrine falcon swooped across the bow of the boat, and then curving gracefully upwards, darted away in rapid flight. In a few seconds uprose the dipper to the surface, and casting back the waters from its feathery mantle, with a peculiar motion of the wings, different from that of duck or diver, flew off in safety to its usual shore. It had evidently, when pursued, and about to be overtaken and slain upon the open waters, instinctively sought the protecting presence of the angler and his boat.

All the British thrushes, including the blackbird and rock-ouzel, occur in Ireland, and, in addition, the gold-vented thrush (*T. aurigaster*) has been once shot near Waterford. It is an African bird, described by Le Vaillant under the name of *Cudor*, as dwelling on the banks of the Grootvis, in the Caffre country. It is remarkable that the missel thrush (*T. viscivorus*) should have been scarcely known in Ireland till of late years, although now a resident species, "pretty generally distributed over wooded districts." It is a bold, pugnacious bird, drives off magpies, and even the smaller hawks, from its own vicinity, and will sometimes strike at the head or hat of human beings who venture too near its nest.

We must here pass over the red-breast, and many other sweet singers of Irish melodies. The absence of that great nocturnal chorister, the nightingale, has already been deplored. Neither does the beautiful blue-throated redstart (*Phœnicura suseica*) ever venture so far west as Ireland. It is one of those numerous summer residents which migrate from Africa into Europe in spring, and spread far northwards into Scandinavia, a few stragglers sometimes showing themselves upon the eastern coasts of England. All the titmice found in Britain occur also in the sister isle, except a rare Scottish species called the crested tit,

pide e fresche, sono la dimora de' Merli *acquajoli*. Là ne' siti più cupi e più adombrati, e ne' forroni profondi, van sempre visitando il margine delle acque, e spesso ancora si tuffano sotto di queste per cercare gli insetti loro ordinario cibo. Sono uccelli sedentarij, e solo quando ne' giorno i più freddi tutte le acque de' torrenti montani son gelate, allora calano ne' fiumi e ne' foati de' colli più bassi, ma giammai vengono in pianura." *Ornitologia Toscana*, totn. i. p. 201. "Abita nell'Italia, ed in molte altre parti d'Europa." *Ranzani, in Elementi de Zoologia*, tom. iii. part v. p. 213.

(*Parus cristatus*). The same may be said of the wag-tails, with a like exception of the blue-headed kind (*Motacilla neglecta* of Gould). The sky-lark rejoices over all Ireland,—the wood-lark (which we have never found in Scotland) is there a residing, but very local species.

Passing over numerous finches, linnets, buntings, &c., found in both islands, we come to the *Corvidæ*, or crow tribe, of which Ireland possesses as many as can be reasonably expected, that is all that are British, except the nutcracker, (*Corvus caryocatactes*), which, besides being merely an accidental bird in England, is scarcely a crow at all. The raven, (*Corvus corax*), which is the king of crows, is distributed over all Ireland. It has been much disputed among naturalists, whether birds which feed on carrion or other garbage distinguish their prey by the sense of sight or smell. As so many species feed on living prey which emit no strong or even perceptible odour, we should *a priori* incline to the belief that the eyes are fully more essential than the nose.

"On one occasion," says Mr. Thompson, "I had interesting evidence of the power of sight in the raven. A nest of young rats, not more than three or four days old, had been dug up in a stubble field, and, after being killed, were left there. Very soon afterwards, two or three ravens passed over the place at a great height, and, on coming above the spot, dropped almost directly down upon them. The young rats had not been ten minutes dead at the time, and consequently could hardly have emitted any effluvium. Besides, they were so small, that, even had they given out any to the air, it seems hardly possible that the odour could have ascended to the great elevation at which the birds had been. Sight alone, I conceive, must in this instance have been the guiding sense."—Vol. i. p. 305.

We think so too. The carrion crow (*Corvus corone*) is rather a rare bird in Ireland, and does not seem to have existed there at all in earlier times. In an old tract, printed for the Irish Archæological Society, titled 'A Brief description of Ireland, made in this yeare 1589, by Robert Payne,' it is recorded that "There is not that place in Ireland where anye venomous things will liue. There is neither mol, pye, nor carron crow." The editor, who rejoices in the somewhat ornithological name of Dr. Aquilla Smith, adds, in a note, that there is no authority as to the introduction of the carrion crow into the island; and that Moryson (who wrote in 1617) confirms Payne, by stating,— "We have not the blacke crow, but onely crowes of mingled colour, such as wee call Royston crows." The magpie (*Pica caesia*) is said to be an imported rather than an original species in Ireland. Although a bird of singular beauty, and, in confinement apt to learn, it is a mischievous creature, and why it should have been imported no one knows. Derricke, who wrote his "Image of Ireland" in Queen Elizabeth's time, has recorded that,

"No pies to pluck the thatch from house
Are breed in Irishe groundes,
But worse than pies, the same to burne,
A thousande may be founde."

Smith, in his "History of the County of Cork," published in 1749, observes that the magpie, "was not known in Ireland, seventy years ago, but is now very common;" and Rutty, in his "Natural History of Dublin," states that "it is a foreigner, naturalized here since the latter end of King James the Second's reign, and is said to have been driven hither by a strong wind." In the "Journal to Stella," Dean Swift makes allusion to the same bird: "Pray observe the inhabitants about Wexford; they are old English; see what they have particular in their manners, name, and language. Magpies have been always there, and no where else in Ireland, till of late years." Mr. Ogilby's commentary (as given by Mr. Yarrell) on this last quotation is as follows:—

"It must be confessed that the testimony afforded by this passage is not so explicit as could be wished. That the magpie existed always, or, in other words, was indigenous to the vicinity of Wexford, and to no other part of the country, is scarcely credible, even if it were not directly contradicted by Derricke. That it might have continued to be a local denizen for a considerable time after its introduction is more probable, and more in accordance with the habits of the bird: and this circumstance of its locality probably gave origin to the popular idea expressed by Swift of its being indigenous to the county of Wexford. We may, however, conclude with greater certainty—for on this point our authority is express—that it was only in the reign of Queen Anne that the bird began to spread generally over the kingdom; that is, at the same period as the introduction of frogs; and indeed I have sometimes heard these two events spoken of traditionally as having been simultaneous. The town of Wexford is remarkable as having been the first place of strength in the island which was reduced and colonized by the English. Even to the present day, the majority of the inhabitants of that part of the country are of English extraction; and it is not improbable that their forefathers brought the magpie with them from England, perhaps as a pet, to put them in mind of their native land; for it is scarcely possible that any one would voluntarily introduce so mischievous a creature. At all events, St. Patrick's curse, which is said to rest so heavily on the whole tribe of serpents, does not appear to have extended to frogs and magpies, for I know no part of the world where both breeds thrive better or faster than in Ireland."—*British Birds*, vol. i, p. 112.

. In confirmation of this statement, Mr. Thompson informs us that Lord Roden's keeper, by ranging the country for some miles around Tullymore Park, and by robbing nests, and shooting and trapping old birds, destroyed during the half year of 1836 above 730 eggs and magpies. The species, from whatever quarter first derived, has been long common over all Ireland. Its congener the Jay (*Garrulus glandarius*) occurs only in the southern districts.

Although Ireland is not destitute of fine timber, it is by no means an arboreal country, and we consequently find that woodpeckers are rare, as we know them to be in North Britain, where none have been ever ascertained to breed. The great spotted species (*Picus major*) is of accidental occurrence in Ireland. The green woodpecker (*P. viridis*) is reported to have bred in some well-wooded districts; but this fact requires confirmation. The cuckoo is a regular spring visitant over Ireland, and all the British swifts and swallows are also found there. The kingfisher is distributed, though sparingly, throughout the island. The nightjar is of more local occurrence.

The great order called *Rasores* (or Gallinaceous birds,) includes among our native species pigeons, pheasants, partridges, and grouse. Ireland possesses all the British pigeons, except a woodland species of stock-dove (*Columba oenas*) found in the midland counties of England, and as yet unknown to Scotland. The turtle-dove (*C. turtur*) is more frequent in Ireland than in the northern parts of our own island.

Of game birds, the pheasant (*Phasianus colchicus*) though originally not even a European species, has been long introduced to, and is now well spread over various wooded parts of Ireland. The period of its importation is unrecorded, but so far back as 1589 old Payne remarks, that "there be great store of pheasantes" in the island, and Fynes Moryson, who lived there from 1599 till 1603, states that there are "such plenty of pheasants, as I have known sixty served up at one feast, and abound much more with rails, but partridges are scarce." From the quantity of insect food devoured by these birds, it is the opinion of many, notwithstanding the great agricultural outcry regarding game, that they do more good than harm to the farmer.* The capercaillie or cock of the wood (*Tetrao urogallus*) though once well known, has been extinct in Ireland for nearly a century. The name is supposed to be derived

* *Observations on Game and the Game Laws.* By J. Burn Murdoch, Esq.

It may be here noted, that the present Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, formerly addressed an epistle on this subject to the late Secretary of State for the Home Department. See Letter from the Earl of Malmsbury to Sir George Grey, "On the Revision of the Game Laws," 1848.

from the Celtic *cappulcaille*, which we understand to signify *horse of the woods*, in reference no doubt to the bird's super-eminent size; just as people still talk of horse-mackerel, horse-flies, horse-leeches, and, when the expression of merriment is somewhat uncontrolled, horse-laughter. The black-cock (*Tetrao tetrix*) notwithstanding its abundance on the opposite coast and neighbouring isles of Scotland, is *not* an Irish species. The natural constitution of the country would seem well adapted to its habits, but it may be presumed that the bird thinks otherwise. Various attempts have been made by Lords O'Neil, Courtown, and others, to naturalize them by means of birds brought over from Scotland, but hitherto without success. They are seen to remain for a time in the district where they have been placed, but they diminish instead of increasing in numbers, and ere long entirely disappear. Our common red-grouse or moor-game (*T. Scoticus*) is well known over many of the extensive heathy districts of the sister isle. The white-grouse or ptarmigan (*T. Lagopus*) as formerly stated, is quite unknown. We believe it is now extinct in both England and Wales.* The partridge is found pretty generally distributed over cultivated grounds and their vicinity, but is much less abundant than in Britain, and has been gradually decreasing till within these last few years, during which this agricultural kind of game has begun to rally.

We shall conclude the rasorial order with a word or two on quails, the history of which is somewhat peculiar in Ireland. It is well known alike to naturalists and sportsmen, (of late years we have rejoiced to see several examples of the character of both combined,) that the quail is a migratory bird, arriving in spring, and spreading, prior to the breeding season, over a great portion of England, and, though much more sparingly, our own country. We have ourselves traced it in many parts of Scotland, but not further north than the side of Loch Achilty, in Ross-shire. The great majority of European quails retire to Africa in winter. The islands of the Archipelago are covered by them, as resting places during certain seasons of the year. Early in autumn such quantities are captured in the island of Capri, near Naples, as in former times to have afforded the Bishop so great a portion of his revenue, that he was called in consequence the Bishop of Quails. On the other hand, in spring, such flights arrive on the western shores of the Neapoli-

* As the ptarmigan is a very hardy species, and does not occur in warm countries except at great heights, near the line of perpetual snow, it may be that the more southern position of Ireland makes that country too hot to hold it. We presume that the Island of Ilay is the most southern locality in which the species is now found in the British dominions.

tan kingdom, that one hundred thousand have been taken in a day. The species is widely spread over Asia Minor, along the shores of the Red Sea, and is well known in India. Now as it migrates in such prodigious numbers, and is the only species of the genus ascertained to do so, additional interest attaches to it as the probable means by which the Israelites were fed in the wilderness.

“He rained flesh also upon them as dust, and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea; and he let it fall in the midst of their camp, round about their habitations.”—*Psalm lxxviii.* 27, 28.

Although the quail is in general a bird of passage, certain exceptions seem to occur even in Europe. It is said to remain throughout the year in Portugal, and there is now no doubt of the singular fact that it does so in Ireland,—a curious coincidence,—these two countries being the most western of the European territories, lying in the same longitude, and being equally under the influence during winter of the ameliorating effect of the great Atlantic waters. There is, in truth, so little frost in Ireland, that these birds may easily obtain their food all the year round, and it is the deficiency of food rather than the fear of cold which seems to influence the movements of many migratory species. From 120 to 300 brace of quails have been killed in Ireland by single sportsmen during the winter season. In regard to the occurrence of the species in Portugal during that season, although we think it highly probable, we do not state the fact upon our own knowledge, but on the authority of Colonel Montagu, (*Supplement to Ornithological Dictionary*), who obtained his information from Captain Latham. We know too little of the ornithology of the great western peninsula of Europe. If the quail is actually found in Portugal all winter, it is certainly singular that it should not be so in Galicia, (its natural continuation,) the most northern province of Spain, and politically rather than physically distinct from Portugal. In the only work we have at hand relating to that part of Spain, the quail is said to be,—“*Comun en toda Galicia. Se presenta en primavera, y emigra en estio.*”*

Two important and productive orders, the shore-birds or waders, (*Grallatores*), and the web-footed or swimming-birds, (*Natatores*), still remain to be considered; but the unforeseen length to which this article has already extended, requires that we should postpone their exposition to a future Number.

* *Catálogo de las aves observadas en las cercanías de Santiago, y otros puntos de Galicia.* Por D. Francisco de los Ríos Naceyro. *See Memorias de la Real Academia de Ciencias de Madrid*, tom. i. p. 110.

ART. III.—*Scriptural Revision of the Liturgy, a Remedy for Anglican Assumption and Papal Aggression. A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M.P.* By a MEMBER of the MIDDLE TEMPLE. London, 1851.

THE Book of Common Prayer is the very kernel of the Church of England. The Liturgy has probably no rival in the affections of the English nation. The exquisite beauty and majesty of its language, the simplicity and dignity of its ritual, the richness and sweetness of its melody, the touching harmony of its cadences, the depth, warmth, and elevation of its devotional spirit, have for ages soothed the feelings, stimulated the piety, and earned the reverence of a great and religious people. We cannot wonder at the exhibition of such phenomena. The Liturgy is the precious tradition of the religious feeling and most exalted aspirations of many centuries of Christianity. All that the most saintly men, under every circumstance of human life and human emotion, have felt in the depth of their souls and poured forth to the God of their adoration—all that the bitterness of the keenest penitence, or the resignation of the profoundest suffering, or the fervour of Christian hope, or the exultation of triumphant faith, or the submission of the sincerest humility, or the intensity of the most earnest prayer has conceived and uttered, is here treasured up for the sustaining of Christian life and perpetuating of Christian feeling during unnumbered generations.

It is a striking testimony to the intrinsic excellence of the Liturgy, and to the fidelity and purity with which it expresses the genuine spirit of Christianity, that though descended from such remote antiquity it has lost none of its original freshness. It is as serviceable for the present generation, as thoroughly adapted to the utterance of our profoundest, as also of our most varied and delicate feelings, as if it had been composed in our own day. Nay, it is more so; for without meaning any disrespect to Archbishops of Canterbury, who, it may be confidently asked, on hearing the occasional prayers put forth from time to time by the authority of the Queen in Council, has not been struck by the very perceptible discord between the new and the old, and has not found the additions of modern composition to fall short in power and beauty of language as well as in depth and simplicity of feeling?

The musical and rhetorical excellence of the Liturgy will excite greater surprise, when it is remembered that, for the most part, it consists of translations from Latin. What other work can be placed by its side, in which a literal version from a foreign

tongue is felt to surpass native and original compositions in harmony, richness, dignity, and variety of expression? What English prose will venture to challenge a comparison with the majesty and melody of the collects? Shakespeare and Milton may have equalled them by the happiest efforts of their genius: we know of no prose writing that could bear such a trial.

The cause of the superiority is plain. The Liturgy is the choicest selection of what has been proved to be best during a long lapse of time. Its litanies and its collects are the fruit of the most sublime piety and the noblest gifts of language, tested by long sustained trial. Had they not sprung from the inmost depths of human nature, thoroughly penetrated and christianized by religion, they never would have retained their pre-eminence in public worship, much less have continued to be a living fountain of devotion for the nineteenth as truly as for the sixth century. No single generation could have created or could replace the Liturgy. It is the accumulation of the treasures with which the most diversified experience, the most fervent devotion, and the most exalted genius, have enriched the worship of prayer and praise during fifteen hundred years. Who, then, can overestimate its influence in perpetuating the sacred fire of Christian love and Christian faith amongst a whole people, or exaggerate its power in conserving the pure and apostolical type of Christian worship?

Nevertheless, the Liturgy is a work of mortal origin; and, be it never forgotten, must bear the impress of human frailty. We must not be idolaters even of what is good and holy; for idolatry is the ruin of the soul. The reverence felt for saintly piety has often betrayed admiration into extenuating, and not seldom into imitating, the failings which accompanied it. An indiscriminate veneration for a Liturgy may easily become the parent of fearful evil, by perpetuating and consecrating in extensive churches errors both of feeling and doctrine. The higher the image of Christian virtue the more imminent is the danger incurred by undiscerning admiration. The Liturgy, though a genuine emanation from the pure spirit of Christianity, has not been endowed with the infallibility of inspiration. The manner of its construction has exposed it to inevitable detriment. It was impossible that the effusions of a long series of worshippers should not be tinged by the colour of thought of the ages in which they lived. No man can escape wholly the influence of his time. The philosophy and doctrinal views of each passing century could not fail to imprint their stamp on the language even of prayer, much more on that of creeds and declarations of doctrine. It is no dishonour to the Liturgy that it is subject to the universal law of humanity. English clergymen, indeed, often speak of it

in terms which place it on a level with the Bible, thereby conferring on it a practical infallibility, warranted neither by fact nor Scripture. Carried away by the admitted goodness of what they exalt, they become careless of observing strict accuracy in the expressions which they apply to it. They little suspect the guilt they are incurring by sowing the seeds of idolatry, and are as little aware that the conversion of respect and love into superstition has been the prolific source of most of the corruptions which have marred and disgraced the Christian religion.

It may be said that this necessary admixture of error furnishes a strong objection against the adoption of a fixed form of prayer. It cannot be denied that the objection has some foundation of truth; the weight, however, to be attached to it is a matter of difficult determination, which must vary very much at different times, and must depend on the particular form of prayer adopted and the temper and circumstances of each church. It is not our object in this article to discuss the relative advantages of a permanent Liturgy and of the extempore ministrations of the prophetic office, as adopted in Presbyterian churches. We are dealing with the Liturgy of the Church of England as an established fact, based on the predilections, or prejudices, if so they are called, of the English people; but in regard to this special objection to liturgies, we may remark that it applies with greater force to creeds and formularies of doctrine, such as all Churches possess, than to public prayer; for the scientific language of such statements is more intimately connected with the intellectual and philosophical development of the age in which they were framed, is more directly local and temporary than the more general outpourings of prayer. The language of the affections of the heart, whether in worship or poetry, is universal; it belongs to all times and places, and is little influenced by the revolution of years; whilst declarations of formal theology, involving of necessity scientific views of philosophy, are sure to be coloured by the intellectual state of those who reason them out from the revelations of Scripture.

It is a very remarkable fact, that the Liturgy, whose participation—to whatever extent—in human weakness no intollient man will dispute, should have withstood unchanged the buffeting winds and waves of human opinion during three centuries of Protestantism, centuries distinguished by restless activity of thought, by violent fluctuations of theological views, by a mighty progress in literary development, and by the boldest challenging of the foundation of all intellectual and religious belief. The amount of gold contained in the Liturgy, when compared with the dross, will partly account for this striking occurrence: the remainder of the explanation will be supplied

by the historical position of the Church of England. That Church is so intimately mixed up with the civil polity of this country as to form a very prominent and integral part of its constitution; and thus it has been protected by the tenacity with which the English have always clung to their institutions, and the vigour with which any organic change in them has been invariably resisted. The prescription of habitual reverence made the people slow to discern blemishes in the natural nobleness of their Liturgy; and even if their existence had been admitted, it would have required the irritation of positive harm created by them to reconcile the bulk of the nation to alterations in services consecrated by long use and devotional tenderness. Moreover, the Church of England is a Church of compromise: she shares the peculiar characteristic of all English institutions. Her constitution was framed with the express design of embracing diverse and antagonistic elements as certainly as the secular polity comprehends Whigs and Tories, Free Traders and Protectionists. History bears witness to the practical carrying out of the intention which animated her founders. The Church of England has ever since her birth manifested herself as a broad and comprehensive Church, chequered by a wide variety of religious opinions. The coexistence of diverse and often mutually repulsive parties within the communion of the Established Church has been recognised and sanctioned by the national feeling. The sense of the country would be as greatly shocked by a proposal to make the Church more homogeneous by the ejection of one of its elements, as by an attempt to render the nation more uniform by the suppression of a political party. This comprehension of conflicting views within one Church is doubtless a matter open to much debate: its propriety has been vehemently questioned on theoretical grounds, but its practical existence is indisputable. The people of England have been long habituated to hear opposite doctrines from the same pulpit, to see bishop arrayed against bishop, and to have High Churchmen and Evangelical succeeding each other in the same parish: such was the Church which their fathers handed down to them, and if only moderation will repress extravagance and exclusiveness, they do not desire that it should be otherwise. Hence the forbearance and respect shown towards a minority by the majority of the day; hence also the reluctance to make innovations in the Liturgy. No portion of it, however offensive to the views of many, has ever been destitute of the support of sincere defenders; and invincible has been the unwillingness to remove what was thought erroneous at the cost of expelling a large body of members from the communion of the Church. To give absolute predominance to one set of religious opinions by the

alienation of all others would be felt to be a revolution amounting not to a reform but to a total reconstruction of the Church of England.

But even if changes had been desired by the Church at large, the machinery for accomplishing them was wanting. The Church of England came forth at the Reformation, like Minerva from the head of Jove, of full-grown stature: no means for subsequent development were provided. The Parliament became the legislature of the Church, and that legislature has ever shewn itself to be most averse to entertaining any project for the modification of that Church. The sentiment is natural. Indisputably it has been the ægis of the establishment, and the chief instrument of its preservation. At no time has Parliament been a suitable arena for the discussion of doctrine; and the difficulty has greatly increased in later times. Who that loves the Church and values the services which she renders to religion, could desire to see her constitution the subject of incessant debate in the House of Commons? Which of her friends would not mourn, if every ecclesiastical theorist in Parliament, every enthusiast of every party, every nonconformist of the many sects who now have seats in the legislature, could raise unceasing motions on her articles, her creeds, her worship, and her institutions? Who is not conscious that her dissolution would be close at hand? But if this deeply rooted feeling works good, it has also its alloy of evil. Its tendency is to stereotype every part of the Church's constitution, to render all change impossible, to prevent improvement, however urgently it may be needed, or however innocent it may be of interfering with a single vital principle of the Church's doctrine. It requires almost as strong an effort—there are almost as many obstacles to be surmounted—to make an alteration in a service, or to omit a phrase in a prayer, as would be required to abolish or remake the Liturgy. Can it therefore be a matter for surprise that the Liturgy should retain unchanged the stamp which was impressed upon it in the 16th century? The Restoration offered a rare and valuable opportunity for introducing modifications, and also for providing some means for amelioration of detail from time to time; for the whole Liturgy had to be re-enacted in Parliament: but the fury of the political reaction clamoured blindly for the simple restoration of those old forms both in Church and State which had been swept away. It refused to see defects: it hated every improvement that savoured of recent progress. Such as the Church had been for a century, such it was decreed it should continue for ever; and, with a few slight alterations, the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth was reincorporated into the English constitution.

It cannot be denied that the Church of England is hereby exposed to a very formidable danger. An institution which

never varies is doomed by the law of mutability which acts on everything else to get out of harmony in some of its parts with the world that surrounds it: and thus one or other of two consequences is wont to occur. It more commonly happens that the parts which have ceased to be applicable to the wants and feelings of a new generation grow obsolete—their existence is ignored—words, if required to be used, are evaded by the help of a non-natural sense, or are looked upon as simply unmeaning sounds: the concurrent interpretation of society being held to be authorized to change and even reverse the ordinary meaning of language, though avowedly and intentionally employed in the most binding strictness. By such a process men have reconciled themselves to take oaths, whose obligations they had no intention whatever of observing, and have subscribed formularies whose import they repudiated. Whatever may be thought of the morality of such acts, when universal consent has ratified the perversion, and the *animus imponentis* may be said to justify the accepting of the obligation as either wholly nugatory, or as reversing the pledge, it is at least clear, that whilst the change of opinion is in progress, and before all are agreed as to the virtual repeal of the natural sense, much stress must be laid upon individual consciences, much temptation to untruth brought to bear on many, much damage inflicted on the moral character, (and that just in proportion as the conscience is tender,) and much hardship and loss entailed on those who refuse to take a pledge which they still understand to mean what its words set forth.

This, however, is not the usual course with religious services. The language of daily prayer can hardly ever grow dead; the feelings of every thinking man recoil from addressing words to God, which do not mean what they seem to say. The hardening of the conscience, though not wholly unavoidable, will seldom be the chief evil produced by a long unchanged liturgy. The sense of the unsuitableness of the offending portion will remain awake; it will gradually strengthen into dislike, and dislike into hostility, and thus, the healing hand of reform being withheld, the dammed up waters of revolution will ever threaten destruction in the back-ground. Those who have seen this peril averted in secular affairs by an amount of change which fell little short of a revolution, may yet live to see a similar danger, but we fear with a sorer and more ruinous catastrophe, assail the Church of England. Symptoms of internal fermentation, of that commotion of mind which usually precedes a national convulsion, have already been neither few nor insignificant. The religious and intellectual characteristics of our time are peculiarly calculated to bring on and augment this danger. We live in an age of great intellectual activity and great religious earnestness. In-

dividual men of more towering understandings have existed at other periods of our history ; but never before has mental energy been so universally developed, or first principles explored with such acuteness and daring fearlessness. Never before were the results of thought diffused so quickly through the community, or carried out in action with such ready power and accumulated support. On the other hand, highly as the religiousness of other epochs has been vaunted, we doubt whether deep religious earnestness was ever so general among the upper classes as it is now. Respect for religion has increased on every side. Religion is now honoured where it was wont to encounter ridicule. No character is so damaging, even for mere worldly objects, as to be accounted irreligious. Religious motives, religious feelings are daily avowed in Parliament, and instead of exciting ridicule or being denounced as cant, meet with sympathy and confer credit on the speaker. Infidelity itself has ceased to sneer : it has become religious. A contemptuous and mocking unbeliever, a Voltaire or a Diderot, would be banished from all good society. Religious questions engage the attention of all classes. The religious aspect of all our social institutions is examined with the liveliest interest. Religious convictions are followed up with the noblest exhibitions of self-sacrifice. The seductions of a luxurious civilisation are inadequate to suppress the swelling ebullitions of missionary self-denial. Honoured men are seen every day to renounce wealth, rank, influence, and worldly prospects at the bidding of religious persuasion, and they are not sneered at as fools. Churches are burst asunder by the violence of religious commotion ; and vast establishments of clergy are driven forth from their pulpits and their homes by the irresistible force of conscience, and confederate in new churches.

In an age like this, amidst such irrepressible impulses of conscience and intellect combined, the anomalies produced in the Liturgy by the circumstances of its origin and the lapse of time were sure to excite awakened attention and uneasiness. The founders of the English Church built her communion upon compromise ; many of the reasons which guided them to select such a foundation are unimpaired in strength ; but the circumstances which surround the Church are altered. An age of general thoughtfulness and earnestness is adverse to compromise. A common danger compels men to sink subordinate differences for the sake of obtaining common security ; when the danger is removed, concessions made under the pressure of alarm lose the motive which prompted them, and in religious matters soon wear the appearance of abandonment of principle. Irritation and internal conflict are speedily engendered ; the repulsive forces of the heterogeneous elements combined in the compromise acquire strength under the heat of religious zeal ; and dis-

ruption is at hand. Thus it has fared with the Liturgy. Fear of Rome and the critical position of Protestantism, made the best and most earnest men intensely anxious, when the Liturgy was revised at the opening of Elizabeth's reign, to include the largest possible number of persons within the communion of the Church of England. Passages more consonant with Romanist views were introduced into the services; an unfortunate process, pregnant with much mischief; for it founded the comprehensiveness of the Church, not on the common truth acknowledged by all, but on the combination of contradictory elements. Each party thus could sustain itself on passages which positively supported its own views; but then each party also became committed to passages which it positively dissented from; real reconciliation was impossible, and the materials for bitter strife within the Church were handed down to coming generations. These materials the religious earnestness and analytical temper of this age are fanning into flame. A new spirit has broken out amongst the clergy. The Catholic and Protestant principles embodied in the Church's formularies were not formerly pushed to extremity; neither claimed the Church as exclusively their own. Both parties were content to live and let live, never coalescing into intimate union, but neither seeking absolute dominion by the extrusion of the other. Bramhall, Andrews, Hall, and Beveridge, nay, even Laud himself never repudiated Protestantism. It was reserved for our day to penetrate more deeply into the first principles of the conflicting beliefs, till at last the rise of Oxford Tractarianism brought the struggle to a crisis. With wonderful subtlety of thought, and by the help of a most searching analysis, this famous school exhibited in the full blaze of light the radical and irreconcilable antagonism of the fundamental principles of the Protestant and Catholic systems; and as the necessary and reasonable result of this demonstration demanded that the Church of England should no longer halt between two utterly inconsistent opinions, but should emancipate itself into the full freedom of holding one harmonious view of doctrine,—they renounced Protestantism openly and by name; they urged the erasure of every Protestant sentiment which sullied the purity of Catholic doctrine; they preached reconciliation with Rome and the restoration of one Universal Church.

Never at any previous period of the Church of England's history had the incompatibility of the elements involved in her constitution been so signally demonstrated; never had such a deliberate, systematic, and powerfully-reasoned attempt been made to carry out one set of principles exclusively through her whole constitution. The ablest and most earnest of the Tractarians struggled with desperate energy and unrivalled resources

of talent and knowledge to render Catholicism universally and exclusively triumphant ; and, when foiled in the attempt, they evinced the sincerity of their convictions by abandoning the Church whose Protestantism they admitted and disowned. And then the Church sustained, by conversions to Romanism, losses unprecedented in her history. The nation became alarmed ; for the number and character of the converts attested the soundness of the logic which could not rest satisfied with the discordant teaching of a Church founded upon compromise. The eyes of all were opened to the really Romanistic nature of the Anglo-Catholicism scattered over the Church's formularies. It was seen that the Liturgy was the weapon with which Tractarianism did battle. The Anglicans extracted passages from the Liturgy which were of Catholic descent, erected these into the standard of doctrine, and required the whole Liturgy to be remodelled upon that standard. Here, plainly, was the root of that teaching which first made men Anglo-Catholics, and then leading them on to Rome, brought trouble and disunion into so many families, and a sense of insecurity upon all. The people were incensed at the treason which their ministers were committing against the Protestant faith ; the clergy took shelter behind the Liturgy, pointing to its language as the justification of their tenets. Thus the Liturgy was placed in the van of the battle, a rampart behind which Tractarianism defended itself, an object of assault to Protestant wrath.

Every section of the Liturgy was now keenly scrutinized in the controversy. Each party had to dive below the surface, for it had become a contest of principles ; and it was on the principles underlying the language that the battle turned. Protestants—especially the Evangelical section of them—were startled to discover how much of the ancient Catholicism had been retained, and how difficult it was, therefore, to put Tractarians palpably out of court. "The Protestant Church of England" had been their motto ; violent was the shock when they were compelled to learn that their Church was not wholly free from the taint of Catholicism. The alarm, which had gone on increasing whilst defections to Popery multiplied, reached its acme when the Papal Bull proclaimed the elation of Rome at the successes it had won, and its confident advance upon England as to an already assured conquest. Public indignation broke out on every side ; the most vehement desire was manifested to get rid of the Tractarian treason and of the cover behind which it lay. The warmth of Protestant passion rose higher than reverence for the Liturgy and fear of organic reform. Hosts of enthusiastic laymen announced their resolution to purify the Liturgy and vindicate the genuine Protestantism of the Church of England.

However, this overwhelming display itself of Protestant feeling saved the Liturgy from being again replaced in the crucible. Protestant fears were allayed by the public demonstration of the soundness of the national heart towards the Protestant faith. Rome lowered her arrogance; and the public, content with its victory, shrunk, as was natural in Englishmen, from pressing on radical reforms on the tabooed ground of the Church. But a warning was then given which no Statesman and no Churchman may neglect with impunity. An impression has been made concerning the real character of parts of the Liturgy which is sure to work its way more deeply into the public mind. The causes calculated to produce irritation and danger remain unaltered; they are only less active for a while. Puseyism, far from acknowledging itself defeated on the merits of the controversy, insists on the inconsistency of the various parts of our formularies, and sustains itself as firmly, if not as proudly, as ever. Indeed, in some respects, it has won a better position than it held before. The radically Protestant character of the English Church has, it is true, been irrefragably established; but, on the other hand, the cry for a reform of the Liturgy is a virtual admission that some of its elements do not harmonize with the spirit and essence of the Church. This is, so far, solid ground for Puseyism; and so long as it remains to stand upon, so long Tractarianism may vindicate its continuance within the communion of the Church. And if this system of theology shall strike its roots more deeply into the minds of the English clergy, and shall separate them by an ever-widening gulf from the sympathies of the laity,—if it shall continue, as it must and will, to convert the utterances of public prayers into a teaching which is in discord from the general tone of the Church, and shall send forth its disciples in a perpetual stream to Rome,—who can predict the fate which may await the Liturgy, or even the Church herself, at some future day?

But there are other symptoms besides the uneasiness felt respecting the doctrines contained in some of the services which indicate the growing desire for Liturgical reform. The fetters which cramp the action of the clergy in accommodating their ministrations to the manifold wants of society, excite a longing for greater freedom in minds otherwise little disposed to admit the existence of any imperfection in the institutions of the Church. Already, at Birmingham and elsewhere, the services have been remodelled, by shortening their length and re-arranging their parts; and the Ruridecanal Chapter of Leeds, under the presidency of Dr. Hook, has published a report which proposes Liturgical improvements to the utmost extent which can be realized by mere transposing and readjusting. It is obvious that nothing but a strong aversion to apply to Parliament

for the necessary authority for effecting changes prevents Dr. Hook and many others from actively bringing forward proposals embracing extensive changes in the machinery of the Church. The desire to carry out such improvements is one of the chief motives that prompt the demand for Synodic action; their need is keenly felt, and the legislative means for effecting them are eagerly sought.

It is not probable that English statesmen will ever consent to the creation of a synod whose authority should rival, and, when firmly established, overrule, that of Parliament. It is certain that in no case will they allow any ecclesiastical body to modify, by its own right, the doctrines professed by the Established Church. On the other hand, the dislike of applying to Parliament for doctrinal reform, and the unwillingness of Parliament to entertain any such proposals, grow stronger every day. The Church is thus left to itself, to take its chance of standing or falling in the form in which it was originally constructed at the Reformation. There is great danger incurred by not repairing the ancient edifice; there is danger likewise in attempting to remould it. And thus, with respect to the Liturgy, the practical and very important question arises, whether the theological views apparently embodied in some of its offices are so dissonant from the prevailing spirit of the Church itself, and so repugnant to the sentiments of most of its members, as to call on Parliament to overcome its aversion to legislate, and to avert the risk of a fatal explosion hereafter by providing a remedy whilst a remedy may still be had.

We will now examine the points against which the strongest objections have been levelled. The first that meets us is the Athanasian Creed. Few reasonable men can now-a-days be found who approve of the damnatory clauses, however much they may make an outward show of defending them, as incorporated into the Liturgy, and formally subscribed by the clergy; not one, we are confident, would dream of proposing their adoption, if the Liturgy were now compiled for the first time. Who would not shrink from asserting that a heathen of virtuous life must without doubt perish everlastingly? Still more, who is there that in his heart pronounces endless punishment on the earnest and conscientious man who lives in the faith and love of Christ, but yet is intellectually unable to word his creed in the precise phraseology adopted by the Athanasian formula? It cannot be doubted that these clauses are not really assented to by ministers or congregations; and it is greatly to be lamented that bishops have been so perversely foolish as to insist on the reading of the Creed, instead of leaving it to the discretion of the officiating minister. It is a public scandal, and very injurious to national morality,

that such emphatic words should be solemnly used in our churches, and yet accepted by no one; for though each man's conscience may be relieved by the consciousness that the dissent from the natural meaning is so universally understood as to deceive no one, the example of such vehement yet really disavowed assertion is grievously calculated to countenance the low morality which prevails regarding public professions. With respect to the matter itself of the Creed, it is true that the theology of the nineteenth century would not naturally express itself in the language of Hilary of Arles; and that the theory of the incarnation is developed in this Creed to an extent consistent neither with man's real ignorance of this deep mystery, nor with a due reverence for the God-man himself. But, on the other hand, it appears to us that nowhere is the cardinal doctrine of the Trinity expounded with greater felicity and greater power than in the Athanasian Creed. The two fundamental elements of Christian feeling, its two opposite yet correlative poles, are brought out with singular judgment and truth. "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God," sums up the whole of our knowledge of this inscrutable mystery, and proclaims those two truths which should influence a Christian's feelings and conduct. Scripture never intended to reveal to us the real and absolute essence of the divine nature; it could not be grasped by the human understanding. But Scripture has required us to acknowledge, as against Polytheism and Pantheism, the unity of the Godhead, and to realize practically the farther truth, that each of the Divine Persons stands to us in the relation of God—is truly God to us. Towards each we must think, and feel, and act, as God. These are the two practical truths which Scripture reveals, and the Athanasian Creed fully and explicitly declares. Their theoretical and philosophical combination in a single intellectual formula is a problem of which the solution surpasses the power of human reason. To hold them fast *separately* is the Christian's duty; to unite them philosophically neither religion nor reason demands.

The next point objected to is the thanksgiving uttered in the Burial Service, for the removal of the deceased person from the miseries of this world, and the hope that he rests in God. The sincerity of the dead man's faith is thus assumed; yet the Bible and experience alike teach that all professing Christians do not die a Christian's death; and deeply distressing is it often to the feelings of a thoughtful clergyman to be compelled to read this office over the corpse of a notorious sinner. It will be readily granted, that a general statement of the Christian belief in the blessed resurrection of the faithful was all that with propriety could be required in a service applied to every citizen in the

land; no specific assertion concerning particular individuals need to have been asserted. Most desirable as would be such an alteration as would limit the language to a declaration of the general truth, it is nevertheless important to observe that in this, as in some other instances which we shall presently notice, there is no fault to be found with the religious doctrine of the service; in the application of it to a particular person alone lies the difficulty. We are aware how many excellent men have been offended by it, and that in not a few cases secession from the Church has been the result. Honestly respecting their motives, and fully conceding the existence of the embarrassment, we nevertheless think that the so-called "charitable hypothesis" might have reasonably allayed their scruples. Not that the expression is well chosen, or represents the matter in its true light. We prefer to say that the Church of England has constructed her services on the supposition that the rite was complete in all its parts, that the necessary qualifications on every side were present, and that, consequently, full scope might be given to the free utterance of the natural feeling connected with each office, unchecked by any reserve founded on the possible failure of any of the requisite conditions. It may be inexpedient—we are of opinion that it is highly so—to apply without restriction the language of Christian privilege to all the members of a Church into which every citizen is baptized, as a matter of course. Still, it is of the utmost moment to observe that this does not amount to an error of *doctrine*. The theology on which the service reposes is not falsified by perplexities of application only; and when the fact of the inapplicability to all cases is so notorious as to serve as a practical commentary on the words, we can readily conceive that a good man may use them under the assurance that no one is practically deceived by them, and that the necessary correction will be supplied by the understanding of the hearers.

We are now come to a class of cases involving considerations of a far more serious nature; cases in which erroneous and unprotestant doctrine is charged with defacing the purity of the Church of England. Three services, those namely for the visitation of the sick, for the ordination of priests and bishops, and for the baptism of infants, are accused of retaining the traces of Catholic theology. On these Anglo-Catholicism takes its stand: here, if anywhere, may Liturgical reform be demanded on the ground of a corruption of the Protestant faith. We own that the service for the visitation of the sick has never appeared to us to present any formidable difficulty. The objection is directed against the absolution. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who

truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The power of the keys, it is alleged, is here ascribed to the officiating minister; and the exclusive and priestly prerogative of Episcopal ordination and the Apostolical succession is implied. We find nothing in this prayer that can warrant such a conclusion. We do not inquire whether it is desirable or not that a sick and penitent sinner should receive from the Church an authoritative assurance of forgiveness. That he is authorized to gather such an assurance from Scripture, provided his repentance and faith be sincere, no one will dispute; and if the Church deems it proper to impart greater support to a soul trembling under a sense of guilt, by a solemn declaration of that pardon whose sole warrant is the Word of God, then we do not see why a Presbyterian or any other minister may not use this formula as fitly and as naturally as an Episcopal clergyman. In the first place, the prayer for forgiveness distinctly confesses that the absolution comes from God alone: it renders the succeeding confirmation purely ministerial. But in the next, the power of absolving is explicitly asserted to reside in the Church; and this wholly disposes of the objection. The act of the minister is hereby represented as the act of the agent or functionary, to whom the Church has delegated the office of communicating to the sick that assurance of pardon, which it proclaims in the name of Scripture, and which the sick man might himself obtain as effectually and as beneficially from Scripture. The minister indeed announces that he speaks by the authority committed to him by Christ; but this is true of every member of every congregation in every Church. The Church is the depository of all the powers and all the privileges necessary for the continuance and welfare of the Christian society. They emanated from Christ: their exercise is enjoined by his command, and is performed in his name. The appeal to Christ's authority as the warrant for the ministerial function in no way excludes the intervention of the Church. Every preacher who from the pulpit warns, exhorts, and comforts the people, is an ambassador from Christ; he has received a commission from Him thus to speak in the congregation: but that commission came through the Church which appointed him to the ministerial office. Kings and magistrates have from time immemorial proclaimed that they possessed an authority entrusted to them by God; and the claim is just, "for the powers that be are ordained of God." Yet who would build on such language the doctrine that kings held their power directly from God, and irrespectively of the will of the nation—

or that no other form of government but monarchy was legitimate—or that a nation did not possess the right of selecting its own form of government? The assertion, therefore, made by the clergyman in the visitation service does not claim any special right or privilege for Episcopal orders; in many respects it falls infinitely below the pretensions advanced for the pastorate by Wesleyan ministers. The officers of that communion would find no difficulty in using this phraseology; and this is a sufficient guarantee that it does not commit any English clergyman to the Anglo-Catholic theory.

The ordination service, on the other hand, is encumbered with a real, though not insuperable difficulty. The imperative mood in the formula of ordination, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," is objectionable, no doubt, as being open to misconstruction, but contains no untruth; for the Word of God authorizes the Church to believe that the special help of the Holy Spirit will be given to every man who with true piety receives any appointment to any office in the Church. If this belief is well founded, and if the Church chooses to frame her services on the presumption that, man performing his part, God will also perform His, then the assertion that along with the office the grace needed for its discharge is imparted has nothing that ought to wound a Protestant conscience. Lamentable experience shows that all ministers do not receive the Holy Spirit at ordination; but it equally furnishes ground for confidently holding that many do actually realize the Scriptural doctrine that the ministry of the Christian Church is the ministry of the Holy Ghost. An undoubting prayer for the descent of the Spirit would have created no scruples: the imperative form is but a different expression of the same thing. On the other hand, the words, "whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," are not so easy of explanation: for it is hard to say what precise power is here claimed, not for the ministry, but for the Church. That a superstitious sense has been affixed to these words, as if a mysterious power is inherent in the priestly office, is indisputable; but that is a power which the Bible ascribes neither to clergymen nor the Church. The rule for their interpretation must be the meaning in which they admit of being applied to the whole Christian society; for the Apostles alone, according to the Protestant creed, were endowed with powers which were not communicated through and by the Church. If the power of absolving is referred to here—and this is the most probable supposition—we have already seen that this power in the strongest form in which it appears in the Liturgy, is expressly declared to have been "left to the Church;" and when conveyed to the minister by ordination, according to

the interpretation supplied by the service itself for the visitation of the sick, becomes an authority delegated by the Church to pronounce in the name of Christ an assurance of forgiveness or to withhold it, according as the disposition of mind required for the receiving of pardon is present or not in the sinner. No intelligent Protestant can wish to see this formula retained; but even here we may fearlessly maintain that no anti-Protestant doctrine is asserted.

We are now brought to the last and most important topic of our inquiry: the service for infant baptism. This is the great battle-field between Tractarians and Evangelicals, High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen, Catholics and Protestants, within the Church of England. In the view taken of the nature and effects of infant baptism, the vital distinction between Protestantism and every form of so-called Catholic principles is brought to light. To this service Anglo-Catholicism appeals as a distinct recognition of the sacerdotal doctrine. "It is the especial province of Christian laymen at this time," says the author of the pamphlet whose title we have prefixed to this Article, "to protest against that noxious principle of sacerdotal assumption which has been the fruitful source of every superstitious perversion of gospel truth. It is a fundamental error, and a root of almost inexhaustible fertility." Most true is the remark. This is the melancholy moral furnished by ecclesiastical history from the second century down to the nineteenth. This is the fatal poison imbibed from the combined influences of Judaism and heathenism, which has contaminated the pure stream of the Christian faith, and, preying on its vitals, has rendered it comparatively powerless to realize those glorious hopes which its bright dawn ushered into the world. This has been the prolific seed of almost every corruption: the dark and brooding cloud which has obscured the brilliant ideal of Christian truth, which has debased the standard of its purity: and by the interposition between God and the Christian of a mediator as helpless and as sinful as himself, has striven to obliterate the grand characteristic of his faith—his belief in a personal union with Him who is both God and man. This corruption strikes its roots into the lowest depths of human nature: and most hard is it to eradicate.

Sacerdotalism, unable to derive the smallest support from the Christian Scriptures, invented the sacramental theory as a basis on which to sustain itself. In the absence of all authority from revelation it was felt that the doctrine of a priesthood would be more easily accepted, if functions could be devised which appeared to call for the creation of an order of priests. Priests were not needed for the purely ministerial functions of presiding over public worship and ruling the Christian people. But if

men's souls were to be saved by the eating of bread and wine, converted by human operation into the very body and blood of the Lord, and their sins were to be washed away by the sprinkling of water, what could be more natural than that such an awful power over human destiny should be entrusted to a peculiar and separate order of officers? It was no longer in the depths of the human spirit that the feelings, affections, and character of man were to be renewed and purified: they were to be reached through the body. An external agency was now needed; and since on that external agency, by a mysterious law, the state of the soul depended, it seemed to require a special class of men commissioned to wield its mighty influence.* The two parts of the theory exactly fitted together: the soul to be acted on through the body, and priests to administer this action.

"Sacramental grace," says Mr. Dodsworth, "is the very life and soul of the Church system." Does the Church of England profess this priestly theory of sacramental grace? If she does so anywhere, it is confessedly in the baptismal service. It is not to be denied that the High-Churchmen have the natural sense of the words in their favour. They have not been slow to press it, to the great discomfort of Evangelicals: and so unhappy did many of these feel, that either a secession or a successful pressure on Parliament to alter the expressions in the Liturgy might have been the result, had not the Bishop of Exeter, in an evil hour for himself and his friends, resolved to bring the dispute to a crisis, knowing that "the dogmatic theory of baptism becomes of necessity the basis of the entire scheme of Anglican theology." With a full sense, therefore, of the magnitude of the question, he sought to commit the Church exclusively to this particular doctrine of sacramental grace, by means of a judicial decree on the phraseology of the baptismal formularies as they now stand. He appealed to the Church for an interpretation of her own language; but instead of obtaining from her an exclusive recognition of the sacerdotal system, he established the party he assailed in a legality which up to that moment they had not previously enjoyed. He singled out for condemnation an emphatic denial of the necessary connexion between the outward ordinance and the spiritual grace, and expected with confidence, what many on the opposite side equally expected with trembling, an authoritative affirmation of "the catholic doctrine of baptism." But the bishop found to his cost that the uncertainties of ecclesiastical litigation are as disappointing as those of secular. The Church refused to put an exclusive interpretation on her formularies; she justified, as an unoffending Churchman, the minister whose theory severed the rite from the inward virtue, and formally relieved Low-Churchmen from the

difficulty of the baptismal language. The legal position of the Evangelicals was established. Henceforward no one could charge them with rejecting an opinion to which the law had required them to give their solemn assent and consent.

We have said "the Church" advisedly. Great was the wailing, and loud the protest, that the Judicial Committee was not the Church: but all to no purpose. The Judicial Committee is by the law of the Church of England her Supreme Court, the voice by which alone she interprets, the final tribunal by which she judges heresy and every other spiritual cause. It is idle to talk of the modern origin of the Committee. The Supremacy had conferred on the Crown full jurisdiction over all spiritual causes and persons in the Court of Delegates. The Crown might have selected under that right the very members of the Judicial Committee to try Mr. Gorham: and the same authority which had established the Court of Delegates had substituted the Committee in its room. To deny the competency of the Judicial Committee to be the voice of the Church of England, is simply to deny the law and constitution of that Church; and is as absurd as it would be to repudiate the jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench upon the ground of some theory which would prefer a different tribunal. The ecclesiastical legitimacy of the Committee was triumphantly vindicated by Mr. Wilberforce and others, who seceded upon the principle that the highest Court of the Church of England was an institution not consistent with Catholic doctrine. They admitted, whilst they dissented from, the constitution of the English Church.

But now that the Church has sanctioned the legal title of the deniers of baptismal regeneration to be members of her communion, the further and very important question arises, whether it is right or expedient to retain the language of the baptismal office unchanged? It is impossible to evade this inquiry. The Court did not affix its own sense on the language of the service: it simply declared that there was nothing in that language to compel it to expel from the communion of the Church those who expressly, and in terms, rejected baptismal regeneration. It virtually recognised that the authoritative documents of the Church of England do not admit, according to the natural meaning of words, of one harmonious interpretation: and thereupon wisely judged that any opinion sanctioned by the language of one of those documents might be lawfully held, however much it might be contradicted by that of another. It made the Church of England comprehensive of all the doctrines contained in all its formularies. Now, right and necessary as this decision may have been, the embarrassments which flow from it are great and manifest. The irreconcilable conflict between the separate

parts of that whole to which every clergyman is required to pledge his unfeigned assent, is officially admitted by the principle on which the decision proceeded: how, then, can the terms in which subscription is demanded at ordination be any longer justified? What can be more cruel towards tender consciences, and more injurious to good faith, than to insist on a declaration of consent to each single one of a collection of theological opinions, which even the Church herself does not pretend to reconcile together? Then, again, it is clear that the highest tribunal of the Church has given evangelical clergymen no relief in the use of the baptismal service. All that it has done in pronouncing them to be true sons of the Church, has been either to authorize them to attach a non-natural sense to the term "regeneration," or to give them liberty to dissent from the doctrine involved in prayers which they address to the Almighty. Either solution of the difficulty has been felt to be most unsatisfactory and distressing.

The oft-disputed question, therefore, forcibly recurs, What is the doctrine contained in the baptismal service? "The only plea," says our author, "set up in defence of its language by those who persist in vindicating it, notwithstanding the admission that their own view would, even in theory, and apart from the experience of the result, be averse to the use of such language, is the charitable hypothesis." This plea, though elaborately defended by the evangelical Mr. Goode, our author, who apparently is an evangelical himself, proceeds to combat with great energy. We agree with him in holding, that this plea will not successfully defend the language; but we think also, that he has not done justice to Mr. Goode's argument, or pointed out the real objection to it with sufficient force. If baptism were to be administered at confirmation, when the candidate makes a voluntary and public confession of the Christian faith in the presence of God and the Church, Mr. Goode would be perfectly justified in availing himself of the charitable hypothesis, and there would be no reason why the baptized person should not be spoken of as a regenerated man and as a member of Christ. Indeed, our author virtually establishes the charitable hypothesis, when he quotes the Apostle Paul as calling those brethren who yet were guilty of the grossest sins. In fact, St. Paul's language is still stronger: he tells the Corinthians that they "come behind in no gift." Would it be possible to carry the charitable hypothesis farther? But, in truth, the capital, the fatal objection to the present baptismal service of the Church of England; is, that in no case of unconscious infants can we reasonably suppose that the spiritual grace therein implied has been obtained through the spiritual qualification of the recipient. If a spiritual effect

has been produced on the soul of the infant, it must have been produced wholly, *on man's side*, by the agency of the priest: his outward act has altered the mind of the baptized person without any consciousness of his own. This is a superstition which contradicts directly the very idea of Christianity; but it is also the essence of sacerdotalism. It is indisputable, that if the term "regeneration" expresses any spiritual effect on the soul, the baptismal service countenances the sacramental system and the priestly theory. And precisely the same result follows also, if (as some High Churchmen, who hesitated to ascribe to the sprinkling of the baptismal water a transforming power on the soul, have imagined) the effect of baptism is limited to the washing away of original sin. This supposition implies that an infant, who had the misfortune of dying before baptism, necessarily retains the burden of original guilt, and, as Augustine and many others have believed, falls under eternal condemnation. How any person who had obtained the faintest insight into the meaning of the Christian religion could have brought himself to believe that God consigns an unconscious and helpless being to eternal happiness or eternal misery, according as an external and purely mechanical operation has been performed upon him by the instrumentality of others, is what we have never been able to conceive. But certainly, if life or death, and that for ever, depends upon an outward rite, without the slightest mental concurrence on the part of the recipient, the fundamental idea of a priesthood, the intervention of a human mediator between God and man, is established: sacerdotalism has gained its principle: it will have an easy victory over every other impediment.

But, thank God, there is not one word in the New Testament which in the slightest degree sanctions so terrible a doctrine: we are spared the pain, to say the least, of seeing the Christian Scriptures contradicting their own ideal of Christianity. The origin of the mischief is plain. The doctrine of the baptismal service is true: the unconsciousness of the infant is the real *fons mali*. The baptismal service is founded on Scripture; but its application to an unconscious infant is destitute of any express Scriptural warrant. Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a single trace of it to be found in the New Testament. There are passages which may be reconciled with it, if the practice can only be proved to have existed; but there is not one word which asserts its existence. Nay more, it may be urged that 1 Cor. vii. 14, is incompatible with the supposition that infant baptism was then practised at Corinth. The Apostle in this passage seeks to remove the scruples of those Christian partners in mixed marriages, who

believed that a conjugal union with a heathen was a state profane and unholy in God's sight. He reassures them by an argument founded on a *reductio ad absurdum*. You admit, says he, that your children are holy; then be persuaded that the marriage from which that sanctity was derived is holy also. For, were it otherwise; if, as you imagine, the marriage is unholy, then it would follow that the children, that are the fruits of it would be unclean and unholy also; whereas you know and admit the reverse; you confess them to be holy. It is absolutely indispensable for the validity of this argument, that the sanctity of the children should have been *exclusively* derived from the sanctity of the marriage; for on no other hypothesis could the sanctity of the children have furnished a proof of the sanctity of the marriage. Had the children been baptized, they would have been holy in their own right, as members of Christ; and a father, who had had his children baptized, would have effectually demolished the Apostle's reasoning by the simple reply, that the holiness of his children, as members of Christ's Church, was no reason for his thinking the marriage holy, or his not putting away his unbelieving wife. Many, indeed, have explained the term holy as meaning, "have been admitted to baptism," making the verse say, that if the faith of the believing partner had not sanctified the marriage, the children would not have been admitted to baptism, whereas they had been baptized. But this is to re-write Scripture, not to interpret it.

History confirms the inference drawn from the sacred volume. Infant baptism cannot be clearly traced higher than the middle of the second century; and even then it was not universal. Some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scripture it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the Apostles; but the presumption is wholly the other way. Baptism appears in the New Testament avowedly as the rite whereby *converts* were incorporated into the Christian society: the burden of the proof is entirely on those who affirm its applicability to those whose minds are incapable of any conscious act of faith. The example of circumcision is appealed to as justifying the practice. We do not doubt that this example had, as it deserved, immense influence in causing the extension of baptism to infants; and we are quite willing to accept it as an authority for the institution, provided that the two rites are placed upon the same level. The authority is valid, provided it is not pressed beyond the identity of the analogy. Circumcision dedicated the child to God, brought him under covenant with God, and was a sign and pledge that he should receive, from time to time, such blessings as were suited to his capacity and circumstances. Infant baptism may

be and is a repetition of all these things. But no one ever asserted that circumcision renewed a child's mind at eight days old; nor that its omission would have made him liable to eternal perdition. Circumcision, therefore, is a warrant only for an external, though holy, relation being established towards God by infant baptism. The truth, then, is clear. The language of Scripture regarding baptism implies the spiritual act of faith in the recipients. When infant baptism is now spoken of, the necessary modification must accordingly be made in applying *language used by Scripture concerning Spiritual baptism only*. Inextricable confusion has been the inevitable consequence when language used of adults, of persons possessed of intelligence, and capable of spiritual acts, was gratuitously applied to unconscious infants; and it cannot be a matter for wonder, that a totally new conception of the ordinance should have been created by such a perversion. So great was the difficulty felt to be by Luther, who retained infant baptism, and assumed that the language used of baptism in Scripture applied to the baptized infant, that in order to fence out priestly superstition, he imagined that God, who bestowed regeneration, bestowed also, by a direct miraculous act, that intelligent faith which the spiritual nature of Christianity demanded. Our age is not likely to acquiesce in such a solution; but it bears witness to the just perception which Luther had of the impossibility of applying to infants, without a modification somewhere, the Scriptural language regarding baptism.

The non-recognition of the fact that the external rite^{*} of infant baptism is not the baptism spoken of in Scripture is the source of the palpable weakness of English Low-Churchmen in the discussion of this question. They have reason and religion on their side; but in the appeal to Scripture, they are undeniably worsted by their opponents. No shift will ever help them. The advantage possessed by the High-Church party rests on the assumption that what is said of baptism in Scripture may be equally said of the infant baptism practised by the Church of England; and nothing but a denial of their complete identity will or can strip them of this advantage. Evangelicals are afraid of looking at the truth in the face. They are hampered by a superstitious feeling about infant baptism: they are afraid of discrediting it, in spite of the many excellent reasons which justify its adoption; and they are still more afraid of saying that the baptism of the Church of England is not identical with the Spiritual baptism of the Apostles. So long as they refuse to admit the real truth, so long must they be content to carry on this all-important controversy at a fearful disadvantage; and so long must they continue to experience the bitter consequences

of the fact, "that here the spirit of Popery, under one or other of its more specious forms, has for the last three centuries retained a footing within the very stronghold of Protestantism, from which it has never yet been dislodged."

But a brighter day is dawning. Dr. McNeile, Mr. Litton, we may almost add, the Archbishop of Canterbury, are perceiving that the practice of infant baptism is not found in Scripture. When the fact is universally recognised the controversy will assume a new form. The ground will be completely cut away from beneath the sacramental theory; and Protestants will have the full benefit of their own principle—the appeal to Scripture as the form of religious truth. Whilst this historical conversion is in progress, greatly as we deplore the evils which flow from the baptismal service, we regard any attempt to introduce a change as premature.

But let us not be misunderstood: we have not wished to breathe the slightest insinuation against the legitimacy and the importance of infant baptism. We have expressed our persuasion, that it is a rite unknown to Scripture, and that it was probably unpractised in the apostolic age; but we also firmly believe that it is an institution eminently conformable to the genuine spirit of Christianity, as such warranted by Scripture, and in the highest degree valuable to the Christian Church. Scripture furnishes the strongest warrants for believing that the infant children of Christian parents are placed in a peculiar and holy relation towards God. The precedent of circumcision, of itself alone, furnishes ample authority for the dedication of Christian infants to God, and their public incorporation into the Church of Christ. The emphatic blessing pronounced by the Lord Himself on little children—His tender and loving command to bring them to Him—has found an echo in every Christian heart; it has been rightly felt to confer the highest of all possible sanctions on the practice of infant baptism by the Christian Church. Who can estimate the unspeakable importance of the fact, that the soul at the earliest dawn of intelligence should awaken to the consciousness of its consecration to Christ—that it should learn at the same time that it is a religious and a Christian being? What Christian parent does not desire for his child that his opening mind should catch the feeling that he belongs to Christ—that Christ loves him and has redeemed him—and that he is, by a solemn act of consecration, Christ's child? But in the absence of all express institution of infant baptism by Christ or His Apostles, we dare not call it a complete sacrament till the consciousness of the baptized person has become capable of fulfilling the spiritual condition of the sacramental blessing, and become susceptible of its reception. The celebration of the out-

ward rite at an age when intelligence is still dormant separates, in respect of time, the two elements which are necessary to constitute a sacrament: and we have not a particle of authority for supposing that the sacramental virtue can be realized till both elements are present. A spiritual blessing of necessity implies a spiritual recipient. This momentous truth—which lies at the foundation of the Christian faith—has been forgotten by those who hold that infant baptism is a complete sacrament. They have been betrayed into this forgetfulness by the belief that infant baptism was expressly of apostolical origin, and by the consequent pressure of the language of Scripture. They found spiritual blessings attached to baptism in Scripture; but they found also spiritual conditions imposed upon the recipient. The belief that infant baptism was the institution then spoken of involved them in a hopeless dilemma, from which they vainly endeavoured to extricate themselves by overlooking the spiritual state of the infant, and at the same time supposing that God, in some mysterious manner, communicated some equally mysterious blessing to his soul. The very essence of sacerdotalism was involved in this belief. But a mere examination of Scripture has made all clear. The language of the apostolic Church does not apply to infant baptism, and is consequently free from every taint of the priestly theory. The Church indeed advanced, and as we most honestly believe, rightly advanced, in the very spirit of Scripture principles already indicated, to the baptism of infants; but it neglected, whilst modifying the practice, to modify the rule which guided the interpretation of Scripture respecting it. The defect can be supplied now. The Church can and does uphold infant baptism as a truly Christian and most precious institution; but it ought not to speak of it as a full sacrament, until the understanding of the baptized has consciously accepted the Christian faith and ratified the baptismal covenant. Then, and not till then, may the words of Scripture regarding baptism be applied; for then only will the sacrament be such as Scripture in these words supposes it to be.

We are anxious to draw from what precedes the moral of the vast importance of a sound exegesis. Those whose motto and watchword is Scripture should above all others be accurate and scientific in the interpretation of Scripture. Religious controversies are every day assuming more and more the sharp and definite form of an antagonistic struggle between the Christianity of Scripture and the Christianity of tradition. The Word of God is the touchstone by which alone we can distinguish truth from error in tradition—the right interpretation of that Word is the only weapon with which it is possible for Protestants to win the victory. The neglect of a scientific exegesis is, we

grieve to say, the glaring defect of modern English Low-Churchmen—the fruitful source of many defeats. A lamentable distrust of the application of the laws of philosophy and historical criticism to the Bible is the result—war is declared against the progress of the intellect—and powerful adversaries are arrayed against the cause of religion and Scripture. The Bible is capable of vindicating God's truth against all foes; but for this the Bible must be made to utter its own real meaning. The history of the Church throughout numerous ages shews how Scripture may be overridden and set at nought by the traditions of men: it is a two-edged sword, but God has not willed it to be victorious, except for those who know how to use it rightly. Piety is an indispensable qualification in the Christian interpreter; but piety alone will not enable him to discharge his office. Piety has too frequently been associated with ignorant dogmatism and shallow presumption. At no age of the Christian Church has a profound and accurate exposition of Scripture been more urgently needed than in the present day; and we emphatically warn those to whom the Protestant faith is dear, that if they wish to resist successfully the assaults of Popery of every form, and infidelity, they must take their stand on the right interpretation of Scripture.

- ART. IV.—1. *Poems, Lyrical and Dramatic*. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW; with an Introductory Essay, by GEORGE GILFILLAN. Liverpool, 1848.
2. *Poems*. By THOMAS BUCHANAN READ. Illustrated by KENNY MEADOWS. 12mo. London, 1852.
3. *Poems*. By EDGAR ALLAN POE. Edited, with an Essay on his Life and Genius, by JAMES HANNAY. 8vo. London, 1852.
4. *The Poetical Works of WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT*. 3 vols. London, 1850.

It is the unhappy error of nearly all recent criticism of art—of poetry especially—that its judgments have been formed without reference to any high or very distinct standard of what it is desirable and right that poetry should be. A poem is praised because it is well finished, or because it has been dashed off in a masterly way, or because it is “original,” “pathetic,” or “lyrical,” or “well constructed;” or on account of some other properly secondary quality, quite compatible with general worthlessness or positive demerit. We cannot help thinking that a sounder tone of criticism would produce, indirectly, a sounder tone of art than that which at present prevails. It is certain that no artist,—poet or otherwise,—will ever be made or marred by reading good criticism; but it is equally certain that the weeds which flourish under the encouragement of a lax critical system, do discourage and tend to choke the flower of true art; and that these might, in a great measure, be uprooted and done away with, if we would ascertain and ruthlessly declare their worthless and noxious character.

In the art and criticism of America we generally behold the errors of our own art and criticism exaggerated. Happily for the hopes of the world, America has a filial—almost more than filial—affection and reverence for Britain and the “Britishers.” But this attachment is not without its disadvantages: affection and reverence beget imitation; and the imitator is always more or less blind, and, most often, is found to copy the deformities of his model first. In commenting upon the shortcomings of American poetry and criticism of poetry, let us adopt a tone of self-reproval; for, if we have taught errors by our example, we should set the example of repentance. In endeavouring, therefore, to heighten, as far as we can, the common estimate of what poetry ought to be, and in pronouncing American poetry, generally, to be an example of what poetry ought not to be, we would have it understood that we have no intention of implying a favourable contrast upon the side of our own modern writers.

We have placed^{*} at the head of this Article the names of the four poets who seem to us to be the most notable, as yet, produced by America. Two of them, Bryant and Longfellow, have won a considerable reputation on this side of the Atlantic; the other two, Read and Poe, are not so well known here, although, to our thinking, they are quite as well worth knowing as the others are.

We regret that we cannot fully join^{*} in the popular applause of Mr. Longfellow's poems. In what we are about to say of them, it must be understood that we dwell more upon the faults of these poems than we should have done were it not that their merits have already enjoyed more than a fair share of public attention.

In criticizing Mr. Longfellow, we have a part to play that requires some boldness,—we must speak ill of his model, Goethe, who, by a most strange injustice, has of late been permitted to usurp a throne in the seventh heaven of fame, with Shakespeare, Dante, and Homer.

Goethe was probably the greatest critic that ever lived; but we are convinced that the next generation will be astonished at the admiration with which his poetry has come to be regarded by us. In our opinion, Goethe's poetry is always more or less *heartless*. His minor poems are full of warm fancy, exquisitely expressed; but there is more heart in half a dozen of Burns's songs than in all Goethe's minor poems put together. Faust, we venture to think, is immensely overrated. Everybody praises it, and calls it profound, because there is much of it that nobody understands, or was intended to understand. It abounds with deep lines and picturesque passages, but it has no claim to be regarded as the great symbolical poem which it pretends to be. This is proved by what we know of its history. Large portions are unmodified transcriptions of literal stories: the track of light that follows the wake of the black dog turns out to be an optical fact which had been observed by Goethe. Other incidents are anecdotes of the poet's youth; and in the "Intermezzo" there are numerous allusions of a personal and temporary character, *confessedly to be understood only by those who were in the secrets of a narrow literary coterie*. Goethe felt this; but had not the boldness to undeceive his numerous admirers. At an early stage of the composition of "Faust," he saw the prudence of postponing the discovery of its essential defects by allowing it always to remain as a fragment. Of the wickedness and vulgarity for which Coleridge has condemned this poem, we do not speak, for Mr. Longfellow has not so much imitated these, its worst qualities, as its lighter sins of false pretension and charlatanism.

"Hermann and Dorothea" is a charming work, full of profound and simple wisdom, and of clear and sweet descriptive power; but in reading it we are somehow made to think much more of the skilful author than of the hero and heroine. The warmth is always of the fancy, never of the heart.

Judging from Mr. Longfellow's works, "The Golden Legend," "Evangeline," and his miscellaneous verses, we feel pretty well convinced that his ideal of a great poet is Goethe, and that the poems of Goethe that we have named are his favourite models. If so, he has perfectly succeeded in copying many of their faults, though he has seldom attained to their merits of admirable finish and most delicate sensual perception.

We have space to notice, in detail, only a few minor pieces of Mr. Longfellow's, together with his best known poem, "Evangeline," which would certainly have been a notable work had "Hermann and Dorothea" never been written.

"Evangeline" is evidently an ambitious work, and its great popularity has perhaps persuaded Mr. Longfellow that he has succeeded in his attempt to write a great poem. We have, however, to bring against it a few complaints which will probably smite Mr. Longfellow's artistical conscience with a sense of their truth; for we have much respect for this gentleman's understanding, although we decidedly dissent from the public voice, which would place him, we sincerely believe, against his own cool estimate of himself, in the rank of the great abiding poets. As "Evangeline" is commonly, perhaps justly, regarded as being, on the whole, the most notable work in verse hitherto produced by an American, we shall make a somewhat detailed inquiry into its merits and demerits. The subject is decidedly a fine one, and was probably fixed upon by Mr. Longfellow in consequence of the outcry which had been raised by critics in England and America for a poem that should be truly American in subject and scenery. The historical foundations of the poem are these facts:—In 1713, before Great Britain had established her great colonial empire in North America, Acadia, the province now called Nova Scotia, was ceded to her by France. The inhabitants, who seem to have been little studied throughout the whole transaction, were soon induced to swear allegiance to their new masters, upon the sole condition that they should be exempt from bearing arms against either the French or Indians, in defence of the province; the former being, as it were, their countrymen, and the latter connected with them by alliances and by the private bonds of friendship. The English Government objected to this condition, but though some alteration was intended to be made no new oath was administered, and the old oath, therefore, remained valid. Before the termination of the "war of succession," when

Acadia was annexed to the British settlements, and the English extended their possessions in that quarter by the capture of Fort Beau Séjour, the Acadians were accused of having forfeited their neutrality by supplying intelligence, provisions, and quarters, to the French and Indians at Beau Séjour. It is by no means certain how far this charge was just. It was, however, followed by a severe chastisement upon the simple-minded Acadians. The punishment was delayed, and any announcement of its nature avoided, till the harvests were gathered in, that the British army might seize on the grain. The villagers were then called, on a particular day, into the church of Grand Pré, to hear the orders of their new governor, the king of England. It was then announced that all the lands, tenements, herds, grain, and other effects, except money and household goods, of the people, were forfeited to the crown, and themselves to be removed to distant colonies. This precaution of distributing the Acadians among English settlers was taken to prevent the possibility of their joining with the French against their new masters, whom they had now so little cause to love. Ships and soldiers were on the spot to execute this abominable decree. The whole number of persons collected together at Grand Pré on this occasion was somewhat under two thousand, and these were hurried on ship-board with the most cruel confusion, and disastrous and life-long separations of child from parent, husband from wife, and lover from lover. A disaster of the last kind furnishes the story. Evangeline is about to be married to Gabriel Lajeunesse. In the hurry of deportation they are separated by hundreds of miles, and have no means of discovering each other's destination. Gabriel takes to the wandering life of a huntsman in prairie and mountain. Evangeline lives on, moving, according to opportunity, from one place to another, in the hope of finding him. At one moment he passes her on the river, but she is sleeping, and does not hear of his having done so till it is too late to overtake him. She does, however, follow him, and is on his track for months and years. Finally, she gives up the search in despair; and in the last scene we find her an old woman, tending the sick in an hospital, to which an old man, Gabriel, is brought to die. They recognise each other, and he expires in trying to pronounce her name.

"Evangeline" is written in hexameters, or at least in lines that are intended to pass for hexameters, for real hexameters are next to impossible in a language like ours, which owes nearly all its capacity for versification to *accent*, and not to quantity; while, however, true hexameters are almost impossible in English, pseudo-hexameters, like those of Mr. Clough and Mr. Longfellow, are so easy that they entirely miss the great end of metre, namely,

that of imposing a severe external law upon the otherwise rank exuberance of poetical feeling and expression. Such hexameters are, indeed, nothing more than the revival of the "measured prose" which was thought so much of in the days of our grandmothers, and which chiefly consisted in the recurrence, at intervals, of from fourteen to eighteen syllables, of the monotonous cadence that alone distinguishes Mr. Longfellow's verses from ordinary prose.

We commence our extracts from "Evangeline" with the description of the heroine.

"Fair was she to behold, that maiden of seventeen summers.
Black were her eyes as the berry that grows on the thorn by the
way side;
Black, yet how softly they gleamed beneath the brown shade of her
tresses!

Sweet was her breath as the breath of kine that feed in the meadows.
When in the harvest heat, she bore to the reapers, at noontide,
Flagons of home-brewed ale; ah! fair, in sooth, was the maiden.
Fairer was she on Sunday morn, while the bell from its turret
Sprinkled with holy sounds the air, as the priest with his hyssop
Sprinkles the congregation, and scatters blessings upon them;
Down the long street she passed, with her chaplet of beads and her
missal,

Wearing her Norman cap, and her kirtle of blue, and her ear-rings,
Brought in the olden time from France, and since, as an heir-loom,
Handed down from mother to child, through long generations.
But a celestial brightness, a more ethereal beauty,
Shone on her face, and encircled her form, when after confession,
Homeward serenely she walked, with God's benediction upon her.
When she had past, it seemed like the ceasing of exquisite music."

This damsel had of course many wooers, but

"Among all who came, young Gabriel only was welcome:
Gabriel Lajeunesse, the son of Basil the blacksmith,
Who was a mighty man in the village, and honoured of all men;
For since the birth of time, throughout all ages and nations,
Has the craft of the smith been held in repute by the people.
Basil was Benedict's friend. Their children, from earliest childhood,
Grew up together as brother and sister; and Father Felician,
Priest and pedagogue both in the village, had taught them their letters
Out of the selfsame book, with the hymns of the Church and the
plain song.

But when the hymn was sung, and the daily lesson completed,
Swiftly they hurried away to the forge of Basil the blacksmith.
There, at the door, they stood with wondering eyes, to behold him
Take in his leathern lap the hoof of the horse as a plaything,
Nailing the shoe in its place; while near him the tire of the cart-wheel
Lay like a fiery snake, curled round in a circle of cinders.
Off in Autumnal eve, when without in the gathering darkness,

Bursting with light seemed the smithy, through every cranny and crevice.

Warm by the forge within, they watched the labouring bellows,
And as its panting ceased, and the sparks expired in the ashes,
Merrily laughed, and said they were nuns going into the chapel."

The evening of the lover's formal betrothal is ushered in by some extremely pleasing description,—

"Day with its burden and heat had departed, and twilight descending,
Brought back the evening star to the sky, and the herds to the homestead :

Pawing the ground they came, and resting their necks on each other,
And with their nostrils distended, inhaling the freshness of evening.
Foremost, bearing the bell, Evangeline's beautiful heifer,
Proud of her snow-white hide, and the ribbon that waved from her collar,

Quietly paced, and slow, as if conscious of human affection.

Then came the shepherd back with his bleating flocks from the sea-side,

Where was their favourite pasture. Behind them followed the watchdog,

Patient, full of importance, and grand in the pride of his instinct,
Walking from side to side with a lordly air, and superbly
Waving his bushy tail, and urging forward the stragglers."

The scenery of village, forest, and prairie, are given with breadth and distinctness enough to please, though with none of that *more than scientific* accuracy of observation and description which is characteristic of the great poet. The author is profuse in illustrations, which, although they are often striking, are seldom harmonious, or in keeping with the feeling of the passage into which they are introduced. The following lines afford one out of scores of examples which we could bring forward to prove the fault in question:—

In doors, warm by the wide-mouth'd fire-place, idly the farmer
Sat in his elbow-chair, and watched how the flame and the smoke
wreaths

Struggled together, like foes in a burning city. Behind him,
Nodding and mocking along the wall, with gestures fantastic,
Darted his own huge shadow, and vanished away into darkness.
Faces clumsily carved in oak, on the back of his arm-chair,
Laughed in the flickering light; and the pewter plates on the dresser
Caught and reflected the flame, *as shields of armies the sunshine!*"

Here is a piece of singularly good description quite ruined, as far as regards unity of feeling, by the last half-line. What in the world have "shields of armies" to do with a farmer's cosy kitchen in Acadia? a place which probably never saw a soldier till the day upon which a small detachment arrived to put an end to the quiet little commonwealth which had established

itself there. Mr. Longfellow seems to think that an illustration from the Bible will make up in sacredness for any degree of inaptitude. The following are a few instances of this mistake. Evangeline was looking at the evening sky,—

“And as she gazed from the window, she saw serenely the moon pass
Forth from the folds of a cloud, and one star followed her footsteps,
As out of Abraham’s tent yeung Ishmael wandered with Hagar!”

Again, when Evangeline, on learning that her lover passed her on the river while she was sleeping, sets out with the blacksmith in pursuit of him; the “priest,” by way, we suppose, of keeping up his sacerdotal character, bids Basil farewell, exclaiming,—

“See that you bring back the prodigal son from his fasting and famine,
And, too, the foolish virgin, who slept when the bridegroom was
coming.”

Now there is nothing whatever in Gabriel’s behaviour or position to assimilate him to “the prodigal son;” and the inaptness of the allusion in the second line is only surpassed by its irreverence. At another time the villagers were assembled on the beach, waiting for the embarkation of themselves and their goods; and among them wandered the faithful priest, consoling, and blessing, and cheering,

“Like unto shipwrecked Paul on Melita’s desolate sea-strand.”

But not more like unto Paul on that occasion than any other religious person, walking on any other sea-coast, and under any circumstances whatever, would have been. In another place,

“with the winds of September

Wrestled the trees of the forest, as Jacob of old with the angel.”

Our last example of this painfully mistaken kind of illustration is from the death-bed of Gabriel,—

“Hot and red on his lips still burned the flush of the fever,
As if life, like the Hebrew, with blood had besprinkled the portals,
That the angel of death might see the sign, and pass over.”

This, if it can be called an illustration at all, is an illustration “by contraries,” seeing that, in this instance, the angel of death did *not* pass over, and that the flushed lips were a sign rather of Gabriel’s being a fit victim for the destroyer, than one who was free from his power. Another effect of Mr. Longfellow’s want of true poetical sincerity is seen in a class of similes which, by the conspicuous position given to them, are evidently favourites with him, but which seem to us to be conceits often of scarcely a first-rate album rank. The stars, for example, are called “the forget-me-nots of the angels.”

Mr. Longfellow, we believe, makes no secret of his being a

Socinian ; but we should have guessed him to be such from the air of unreality about all the portions of "Evangeline" in which the life and doctrines of Christianity are brought in for artistical effect. The inhabitants of Grand Pré are a great deal too good. They "lack gall to make oppression bitter," and are robbed of their most sacred rights, for which they were bound, as good Christians, to fight to the death, as easily as a flock of sheep are brought to the slaughter. There are occasions when Christians, *as members of a community*, are bound to do their very best towards confounding and slaying their fellow-creatures by whom they are attacked. Such an occasion was that which is represented by Mr. Longfellow as having happened to the inhabitants of Acadia. Let any Christian, English, Scottish, or Irish, fancy that the news had reached him one fine morning, that a French army had taken steps towards "deporting" him and his from their rightful soil, and assuming possession of his property—wife and daughters perhaps included : would his wrath be calmed, and his resistance stopped by such words as Father Felician's address to the simple Acadians ?

"In the midst of the tumult and strife of angry contention,
Lo ! the door of the chancel opened, and Father Felician
Entered with serious mien, and ascended the steps of the altar.
Raising his reverend hand, with a gesture, he awed into silence
All that clamorous throng ; and thus he spake to his people ;
Deep were his tones, and solemn ; in accents measured and mournful
Spake he, as after the tocsin's alarum, distinctly the clock strikes.
'What is this that ye do, my children ? what madness has seized you ?
Forty years of my life have I laboured among you and taught you,
Not in the word alone, but in deed, to love one another !
Is this the fruit of my toils, of my vigils, and prayers, and privations ?
Have you so soon forgotten all lessons of love and forgiveness !
This is the house of the Prince of Peace, and would you profane it
Thus with violent deeds, and words overflowing with hatred ?
Lo ! where the crucified Saviour, from his cross, is gazing upon you !
See ! in those sorrowful eyes, what meekness and holy compassion !
Hark, how those lips still repeat the prayer, "O Father, forgive
them !"

Let us repeat that prayer, in the hour when the wicked assail us ;
Let us repeat it now, and say, "O Father, forgive them !"
Few were his words of rebuke ; but deep in the hearts of the people
Sank they, and sobs of contrition succeeded that passionate outbreak ;
And they repeated his prayer, and said, 'O Father, forgive them !'

If any preacher were foolish enough thus to address good Christians so situated, we trust that he would get well laughed at for his pains, and duly censured by his authorities, for his gross mis-interpretation and mis-application of Scriptural precepts : but

the foolish Acadians repented them forthwith of their righteous wrath and impulse to resistance, and

"Responded

Not with their lips alone, but their hearts; and the Ave Maria
Sang they, and fell on their knees; and their souls with devotion
transported

Rose, on the ardour of prayer, like Elijah ascending to heaven."

Our pity for Gabriel, the betrothed of the fair maiden, Evangeline, is certainly much diminished by knowing that he is one of this congregation of spoonies.

From the extracts we have given, our readers will see that the language of "Evangeline" is very far from answering to Coleridge's standard of poetical phraseology—"the best words in the best places." Mr. Longfellow's words are commonly about as well chosen as those of a first-rate novel writer. The true poet's invincible determination to hunt up from the recesses of his memory, *the word or words which absolutely express his thought or feeling*, is nowhere visible. He would, no doubt, think it great fastidiousness and loss of time, to spend half a day in getting a stanza *quite* right, which he has worked up to a "passable" point in half an hour. He has no sufficient feeling of the fact, that a poem is like the mirror of a telescope in this—that *it is the last rub which polishes it*, and makes it capable of reflecting the heavens. Many are the poets who have nearly scaled Parnassus, and who might have won to themselves enduring names, but that, discouraged by finding the mountain-side barren of laurels, they have refused the labour of the few additional steps which would have brought them to its verdant top.

But Mr. Longfellow's words are not only not the best words, they are not even in the best places. This is an inexcusable fault in a metre so extremely easy as that of "Evangeline." Inversions merely for the sake of getting the long and short syllables into due order, are never allowable, except in highly polished verse, where this, and other apparent carelessnesses, may be introduced with good effect to take off the appearance of laborious finish. Inversions are always allowable for *rhythmical* effect, which is quite a different thing from mere metrical regularity. No one can wish that Cleopatra, in her wilful passion, should have exclaimed,

"Give me Mandragora to drink!"

instead of

"Give me to drink Mandragora!"

Or that the waves and winds that did omit

" Their mortal natures, letting go safely by
The divine Desdemona,"

should have flowed, in Shakespeare's verse, with more regularity; but Mr. Longfellow's inversions are seldom if ever of this character; he rarely becomes sufficiently rhythmical, and never sufficiently polished, in his writings, to justify inversions upon either of the foregoing pleas.

Notwithstanding all these, and other complaints which we might justly make against this poem, we gladly allow that it possesses very considerable merit as a versified romance. The numerous descriptions combine breadth with minuteness of detail very happily, and the story, which is decidedly a fine one, is told so as to work upon the feelings, and to elevate them. We say again that, in these remarks, we have laid disproportionate emphasis upon the blame deserved by the poem, because we consider that the praise which it has obtained has been out of all proportion to its deserts.

Mr. Longfellow has written a very poor drama, called "The Spanish Student." We cannot find in it any passages worth before our readers; but there is one *stage-direction* gives so amusing an example of American "notions" of manners, that we must quote it. The heroine, Preciosa, is a Spanish gipsy-girl, a famous *danseuse*; the Archbishop of Toledo has taken it into his head to put down the ballet in his diocese, and by way of ascertaining the full odiousness of the abuse to be extirpated, the Archbishop summons Preciosa to dance before him at his palace:—

"She lays aside her mantilla. The music of the cachucha is played, and the dance begins. The Archbishop and the Cardinal look on with gravity and an occasional frown; then make signs to each other; and, as the dance continues, become more and more pleased and excited, and at length rise from their seats, throw their caps in the air, and applaud vehemently. The scene closes."

"The Golden Legend" is a poem of the worn-out Faust type, in which the poet, under contribution for a certain amount of theatrical effect, pours forth worldly wisdom, and would-be bitter sarcasm. There are, however, in this poem, two or three very beautiful passages, which we would willingly quote had we space; but we must then to close this notice of Mr. Longfellow with a few extracts from and comments upon his minor poems. The poems, upon the whole, do not deserve anything like the degree of popularity which they have obtained; indeed, the great reputation which two or three of these poems enjoy, is a most melancholy sign of the poverty of the intellectual, and still more of the spiritual culture, of a very large portion of the

"reading public." The following verses, entitled "A Psalm of Life: what the heart of the young man said to the Psalmist," have come to be quoted in our English House of Commons—a place not yet penetrated, if we remember rightly, by Tennyson, or even, except for ridicule, by Wordsworth.

Tell me not in mournful numbers,
Life is but an empty dream !
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
And things are not what they seem.

"Life is real ! Life is earnest !
And the grave is not its goal !
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not spoken of the soul.

"Not enjoyment, and not sorrow,
Is our destin'd end or way;
But to act that each to-morrow
Find us further than to-day.

"Art is long and time is fleeting,
And our hearts though stout and brave,
Still like muffled drums are beating
Funeral marches to the grave.

"In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of life,
Be not like dumb driven cattle ;
Be a hero in the strife !

"Trust no future, howe'er pleasant !
Let the dead past bury its dead !
Act—act in the living present,
Heart within, and God o'erhead !

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of Time.—

"Footprints that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's troubled main,
A forlorn and shipwreck'd brother
Seeing, shall take heart again.

"Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate ;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labour and to wait."

A certain Frenchman, not being quite master of our language, is reported to have exclaimed, in a rapture of admiration at something or other, "*superbe ! magnifique !* in short, pretty well !" This exclamation expresses the sort of feeling one has

upon reading verses like the above for the first time. It is flattering to find that one's most commonplace opinions are thought worthy of being expressed with such astounding emphasis; and we experience, upon reading them, much the same sort of self-complacency as was felt by the *bourgeois gentilhomme* upon discovering, for the first time, that he had been talking prose all his life. But when the first glow of self-love has subsided, we begin to be ashamed of ourselves, for having been duped by such a bundle of loud-tongued and "unimproved" commonplaces; and if we are very good-humoured and not very critical, we shall hush up the business with an "in short, pretty well." But *we*—the intelligent critics of the *North British Review*—cannot reconcile our consciences to any such amiable concealment of the real truth, which, in regard to the above verses, and many others like them in Mr. Longfellow's volume, is simply this, that they are, for the most part, pretentious, unprofitable, anti-Christian trash. What an unconscionable puppy the "young man" must have been—in the moment at least when his "heart" set up this "Psalm" in opposition to the words of the Psalmist! How the "man after God's own heart" would have quailed beneath this "sprightly Juvenal's" reproof! How much wholesome doctrine he lost by living so many centuries before this magnificent discovery of Mr. Longfellow's, that—

"Life is real! Life is earnest!
And the grave is not its goal."

We could be very funny at Mr. Longfellow's expense, had we space to enter into a philosophical analysis of this "Psalm of Life;" but we have to quote another famous effusion called

"EXCELSIOR.

• "The shades of night were falling fast,
As through an Alpine village pass'd
A youth who bore, 'mid snow and ice,
A banner with this strange device—
Excelsior!

"His brow was sad; his eye beneath
Flash'd like a falchion from its sheath,
And like a silver clarion rung
The accents of that unknown tongue,
Excelsior!

"In happy homes he saw the light
Of household fires gleam warm and bright;
Above, the spectral glaciers shone,
And from his lips escaped a groan,
Excelsior!

“ ‘Try not the pass,’ the old man said ;
 Dark lowers the tempest overhead,
 The roaring torrent is deep and wide,
 And loud that clarion voice replied,
 Excelsior !

“ ‘O, stay,’ the maiden said, ‘and rest
 Thy weary head upon this breast !’
 A tear stood in his bright blue eye,
 But still he answer’d with a sigh,
 Excelsior !

“ ‘Beware the pine-tree’s wither’d branch,
 Beware the awful avalanche !’
 This was the peasant’s last good night,
 A voice replied far up the height,
 Excelsior !

“ At break of day, as heavenward
 The pious monks of Saint Bernard
 Utter’d the oft-repeated prayer,
 A voice cried through the startled air,
 Excelsior !

“ A traveller, by the faithful hound,
 Half buried in the snow was found ;
 Still grasping in his hands of ice
 That banner with the strange device,
 Excelsior !

“ There, in the twilight, cold and gray,
 Lifeless but beautiful he lay,
 And from the sky, serene and far,
 A voice fell like a falling star,
 Excelsior !”

From the prevailing tone of Mr. Longfellow’s works, we are justified in assuming, that the example of the young man whose progress is delineated in these spirited verses, is intended for our guidance, or rather for our reverent admiration, and not for our warning. All that we can say is, that we believe the intended moral to be the false one. Give the story its true moral,—the madness of any ambition which is found to be incompatible with homely joys, female love, and unpretentious Christian religion, and we have an undeniably meritorious little poem, notwithstanding the evident “greenness” of the youth’s enthusiasm, and his “clarion voice,” and “bright blue eye,” which do not add to his manliness.

Bryant is the Rogers of America. Probably his poem called “Thanatopsis” is the most finished piece of verse which has proceeded from the American press. We believe that it is re-

garded by the Americans themselves as their most classical production ; and, as such, it has a right to a place in this notice :—

THANATOPSIS.

“To him who in the love of nature holds
 Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
 A various language ; for his gayer hours
 She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
 And eloquence of beauty, and she glides
 Into his darker musings with a mild
 And healing sympathy, that steals away
 Their sharpness ere he is aware. When thoughts
 Of the last bitter hour come like a blight
 Over thy spirit, and sad images
 Of the stern agony, and shroud and pall,
 And breathless darkness, and the narrow house,
 Make thee to shudder, and grow sick at heart ;
 Go forth, under the open sky, and list
 To nature’s teachings, while from all around—
 Earth and her waters, and the depth of air—
 Comes a still voice. Yet a few days, and thee
 The all-beholding sun shall see no more
 In all his course ; nor yet in the cold ground,
 Where thy pale form was laid, with many tears,
 Nor in the embrace of ocean shall exist
 Thy image. Earth, that nourish’d thee, shall claim
 Thy growth to be resolved to earth again,
 And lost each human trace, surrendering up
 Thine individual being, shalt thou go
 To mix for ever with the elements,
 To be a brother to the insensible rock,
 And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain
 Turns with his share, and treads upon. The oak
 Shall send his roots abroad, and pierce thy mould ;
 Yet not to thine eternal resting-place
 Shalt thou retire alone—nor couldst thou wish
 Couch more magnificent. Thou shalt lie down
 With patriarchs of the infant world—with kings,
 The powerful of the earth—the wise, the good,
 Fair forms, and hoary seers of ages past,
 All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,
 Rock-ribb’d, and ancient as the sun—the vales
 Stretching in pensive quietness between
 The venerable woods—rivers that move
 In majesty ; and the complaining brooks
 That make the meadows green ; and pour’d round all
 Old ocean’s gray and melancholy waste,—
 Are but the solemn decorations all
 Of the great tomb of man. The golden sun,

The planets, all the infinite host of heaven,
 Are shining on the sad abodes of death,
 Through the still lapse of ages. All that tread
 The globe are but a handful to the tribes
 That slumber in its bosom. Take the wings
 Of morning, and the Barcan desert pierce,
 Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
 Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
 Save his own dashings; yet the dead are there,
 And millions in those solitudes, since first
 The flight of years began, have laid them down
 In their last sleep—the dead reign there alone.
 So shalt thou rest; and what if thou withdraw
 Unheeded by the living—and no friend
 Take note of thy departure? All that breathe
 Will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh
 When thou art gone, the solemn brood of care
 Plod on, and each one as before will chase
 His favourite phantom; yet all these shall leave
 Their mirth and their employments, and shall come
 And make their bed with thee. As the long train
 Of ages glide away, the sons of men—
 The youth in life's green spring, and he who goes
 In the full strength of years, matron and maid,
 And the sweet babe, and the gray-headed man—
 Shall, one by one, be gather'd to thy side,
 By those who in their turn shall follow them.
 So live, that when thy summons comes to join
 The innumerable caravan, that moves
 To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
 His chamber in the silent halls of death.
 Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
 Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
 By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
 Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
 About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

In this Mr. Bryant has only just missed writing a fine poem; yet, alas! "a miss is as good as a mile." It is *not* a fine poem; for a fine poem ought to contain something unprecedented, in music or in meaning, and "Thanatopsis" contains nothing new at all. It has beautiful movements of verse, as, for example,—

"Yet a few days, and thee
 The all-beholding sun shall see no more
 In all his course."

It has admirable touches of imaginative description, as that of,—

"the continuous woods,
 Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
 Save his own dashings."

Yet somewhere or other, in Wordsworth, or Shakespeare, or Young, or some one else, we have met with the same movements of verse, and nearly the same descriptive touches.

It must nevertheless be granted that such a poem as the above is incomparably preferable to many which have obtained a name for originality, but which, in truth, are merely insane endeavours after originality. "Originality," says Mr. Ruskin, "is never to be sought for its own sake, otherwise it will be mere aberration; it should arise naturally out of hard, independent study of nature." Mr. Bryant's study of nature may have been hard, but unfortunately it has not been independent. He has paced through field, forest, and city, observing many things; but it has always been with a volume of the English poets in his hand. He has, however, the high negative merit of not pretending to a greater degree of independence than he has a just claim to. He is manly, accomplished, sensitive in heart, eye, and ear; but he is not, and does not pretend to be "original."

Mr. Thomas Buchanan Read, as we learn from the publisher's preface to his volume, which is published in England, "one among the youngest of America's poets." This being the case, we do not hesitate to declare our opinion that he is the most promising of the living transatlantic poets. We know of no other American, with the doubtful exception of Edgar Poe, having so much real feeling as is shewn in some of Mr. Read's verses. His feeling is not very profound or masculine, but it is real; and it presents a refreshing contrast with the cold and clever manufactures, which most of his cotemporaries would impose upon us as expressions of feeling. Bloomfield's description of a storm, beginning—

"A chilling blast succeeds: the nearest cloud
Sprinkles the bubbling pool," &c.,

is not more hearty and homely than Mr. Read's "Summer Shower."

"Before the stout harvesters falleth the grain,
As when the strong storm-wind is reaping the plain,
And loiters the boy in the briery lane;
But yonder aslant comes the silvery rain,
Like a long line of spears brightly burnished and tall.

"Adown the white highway, like cavalry fleet,
It dashes the dust with its numberless feet.
Like a murmurless school, in their leafy retreat,
The wild birds sit listening, the drops round them beat;
And the boy crouches close to the blackberry wall.

"The swallows alone take the storm on their wing,
And, taunting the tree-sheltered labourers, sing.

Like pebbles, the rain breaks the face of the spring,
While a bubble darts up from each widening ring;
And the boy, in dismay, hears the loud shower fall.

"But soon are the harvesters tossing the sheaves;
The robin darts out from its bower of leaves;
The wren peereth forth from its moss-covered eaves;
And the rain-spattered urchin now gladly perceives
That the beautiful bow bendeth over them all."

Mr. Read has a very high sense of natural beauty; this kind of description is his forte, although he does not seem to know it, for the most elaborate pieces in his volume are somewhat ineffective attempts at the delineation of human passion—for which he has scarcely sufficient depth and strength. As, notwithstanding its unusual merit, Mr. Read's volume is not likely to fall into the hands of the majority of our readers, we offer no apology for quoting the following exquisite poem, "called the "Closing Scene," at length:—



- "Within the sober realm of leafless trees
The russet year inhaled the dreamy air;
Like some tanned reaper in his hour of ease,
When all the fields are lying brown and bare.
- "The gray barns, looking from their hazy hills
O'er the dim waters, widening in the vales,
Sent down the air a greeting to the mills,
On the dull thunder of alternate flails.
- "All sights were mellowed, and all sounds subdued,
The hills seemed farther, and the streams sang low;
As in a dream, the distant woodman hewed
His winter log with many a muffled blow.
- "The embattled forests, erewhile, armed in gold,
Their banners bright with every martial hue,
Now stood, like some sad beaten host of old
Withdrawn afar in Time's remotest blue.
- "On slumberous wings the vulture tried his flight;
The dove scarce heard his sighing mate's complaint;
And like a star, slow drowning in the light,
The village church vane seemed to pale and faint.
- "The sentinel cock upon the hillside crew—
Crew thrice, and all was stiller than before—
Silent till some replying warder blew
His alien horn, and then was heard no more.
- "Where, erst, the jay within the elm's tall crest
Made garrulous trouble round her unfledged young;
And where the oriole hung her awaying nest,
By every light wind like a censer swung;

"Where sang the noisy masons of the eaves,
The busy swallows circling ever near,
Foreboding, as the rustic mind believes,
An early harvest, and a plenteous year :—

"Where every bird which charmed the vernal feast,
Shook the sweet slumber from its wings at morn,
To warn the reapers of the rosy east ;—
All now was songless, empty, and forlorn.

"Alone, from out the stubble, piped the quail,
And croaked the crow, through all the dreamy gloom ;
Alone the pheasant, drumming in the vale,
Made echo to the distant cottage loom.

"There was no bud, no bloom upon the bowers ;
The spiders wove their thin shrouds night by night ;
The thistle-down, the only ghost of flowers,
Sailed slowly by—passed noiseless out of sight.

"Amid all this—in this most cheerless air,
And where the woodbine shed upon the porch
Its crimson leaves, as if the year stood there,
Firing the floor with his inverted torch ;—

"Amid all this, the centre of the scene,
The white haired matron, with monotonous tread,
Plied the swift wheel, and with her joyless mien,
Sat like a Fate, and watched the flying thread.

"She had known sorrow. He had walked with her,
Oft supped, and broke with her the ashen crust ;
And, in the dead leaves, still she heard the stir
Of his black mantle trailing in the dust.

"While yet her cheek was bright with summer bloom,
Her country summoned, and she gave her all,
And twice, war bowed to her his sable plume—
Re-gave the swords, to rust upon the wall.

"Re-gave the swords—but not the hand that drew,
And struck for liberty the dying blow ;
Nor him, who to his sire and country true,
Fell 'mid the ranks of the invading foe.

"Long, but not loud, the droning wheel went on,
Like the low murmurs of a hive at noon ;
Long, but not loud, the memory of the gone,
Breathed through her lips, a sad and tremulous tune.

"At last the thread was snapped—her head was bowed—
Life dropped the distaff through his hands serene ;
And loving neighbours smoothed her careful shroud,
While Death and Winter closed the Autumn scene."

* This is unquestionably the best American poem we have met with; indeed it is, with one or two exceptions, the only American poem we have read, or could have read, over and over again. It is an addition to the permanent stock of poetry in the English language, and is worth a whole album of "Excelsiors," "Psalms of Life," and other such drum-and-trumpet moralities which are so abundantly supplied to an applauding public on this and on the other side of the Atlantic. There are faults in this little poem which greatly diminish its value as compared with what it ought to have been, and might have been, under the diligent and discerning polish of Mr. Read.

"The embattled forests crewhile armed in gold,
Their banners bright with every martial hue,"—

are a sad interruption to the tone of peaceful melancholy which is otherwise admirably sustained throughout the poem; and the image is, moreover, in itself, good for little or nothing. The five concluding stanzas are not nearly up to the mark of the preceding portion of the piece, which, as far as regards general construction and form, is almost spoilt by them. But the first thirteen stanzas, taken by themselves, constitute a truly inspired little poem. Tennyson himself, the great modern master of that kind of description which employs the objects of outward nature as a language for human feeling, has scarcely surpassed, in its way, this passage, which, in our opinion, merits the fame that Gray's celebrated "Elegy" has obtained, without deserving it nearly so well. The feeling of the three opening stanzas—the only unexceptionable passage of more than two or three lines in Gray's poem—is here sustained to a far greater length, and with much simpler language and imagery. Mr. Read's volume affords other equally remarkable instances of perception and polish; but in no other instance does he seem to us to have arrived at such depth of poetical feeling. We would willingly quote the whole of "Love's Gallery," but for want of space must confine ourselves to two of its beautifully-finished portraits.

BERTHA.

- "Mild Bertha's was a home withdrawn
Beyond the city's din;
Tall Lombard trees hemmed all the lawn
All up the long straight walks, a dawn
Of blossoms shone within.
- "Along the pebble paths the maid
Walked with the early hours,
With careful hands the vines arrayed,
And plucked the small intruding blade
From formal plots of flowers.

- " A statued Dian to the air
Bequeathed its mellow light ;
She called the flying figure fair,
The forward eyes and backward hair,
And praised the marble's white.
- " Her pulses coursed their quiet ways
From heart to head controlled ;
She read and praised, in studied phrase,
The bards whom it were sin to praise
In measured ~~and cold~~ cold.
- " I love the broad, bright world of snow,
And every strange device
Which makes the woods a frozen show,
The rivers, hard and still ; but, oh,
Ne'er loved a heart of ice."

AURELIA.

- " Where flamed a field of flowers, and where
Sang noisy birds and brooks,
Aurelia to the frolic air
Shook down her wanton waves of hair
With laughter-loving looks.
- " Her large and lustrous eyes of blue,
Dashed with the dew of mirth,
Bequeathed to all their brilliant hue ;
She saw no shades, nor even knew
She walked the heavy earth.
- " Her ringing laughter woke the dells
When fell the autumn blight ;
She sang through all the rainy spells,—
For her the snow was full of bells,
Of music and delight.
- " She swept on her bewildering way,
By every pleasure kissed—
Making a mirth of night and day ;
A brook all sparkle and all spray,
Dancing itself to mist.
- " I love all bright and happy things,
And joys which are not brief ;
All sights and sounds whence pleasure springs ;
But weary of the harp whose strings
Are never tuned to grief."

We regret that we are compelled to add, that in Mr. Read's volume, as in the volumes of nearly all young poets who have

ever written, there is much that the world will willingly let die.

Edgar Poe is more generally known among us for his prose tales than for his poetry, of which he has written very little. He has produced one poem which will be remembered and read when nine-tenths of the popular poets of the day shall be forgotten.

Our readers will thank us for adorning our pages with this piece, which is called "*The Raven*," in its integrity.

Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore—
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door—
'Tis some visitor,' I muttered, 'tapping at my chamber door—
Only this, and nothing more.'

"Ah, distinctly I remember, it was in the bleak December,
And each separate dying ember wrought its ghost upon the floor.
Eagerly I wished the morrow; vainly had I sought to borrow
From my books surcease of sorrow—sorrow for the lost Lenore—
For the rare and radiant maiden whom the angels call Lenore—
Nameless here for evermore.

"And the silken sad uncertain rustling of each purple curtain
Thrilled me—filled me with fantastic terrors never felt before;
So that now, to still the beating of my heart, I stood repeating,
'Tis some visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door,
Some late visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door,
That it is, and nothing more.'

"Presently my soul grew stronger; hesitating then no longer,
'Sir,' said I, 'or Madam, truly your forgiveness I implore;
But the fact is, I was napping; and so gently you came rapping,
And so faintly you came tapping, tapping at my chamber door,
That I scarce was sure I heard you,'—here I opened wide the door,
Darkness there, and nothing more.

"Deep into that darkness peering long I stood there, wondering,
fearing,
Doubting, dreaming dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before;
But the silence was unbroken, and the stillness gave no token,
And the only word there spoken was the whispered word 'Lenore!'
This I whispered, and an echo murmured back the word 'Lenore!'
Merely this, and nothing more.

"Back into the chamber turning, all my soul within me burning,
Soon again I heard a tapping, something louder than before:
'Surely,' said I, 'surely that is something at my window lattice;
Let me see then what thetreat is, and this mystery explore—
Let my heart be still a moment, and this mystery explore;—
'Tis the wind, and nothing more.'

“ Open here I flung the shutter, when with many a flirt and flutter,
In there stepped a stately Raven of the saintly days of yore :
Not the least obeisance made he ; not a minute stopped or stayed he ;
But with mien of Lord or Lady, perched above my chamber door—
Perched upon a bust of Pallas, just above my chamber door—
Perched, and sat, and nothing more.

“ Then this ebony bird beguiling my sad fancy into smiling,
By the grave and stern decorum of the countenance it wore,
‘ Though thy crest be shorn and shaven, thou,’ I said, ‘ art sure no
craven,
Ghastly, grim, and ancient Raven, ^{~ ~ ~}wandering from the nightly shore,
Tell me what thy lordly name is, on the night’s Plutonian shore !’
Quoth the Raven, ‘ Nevermore.’

“ Much I marvelled this ungainly fowl to hear discourse so plainly,
Though its answer little meaning, little relevancy bore ;
For we cannot help agreeing, that no living human being
Ever yet was blessed with seeing bird above his chamber door—
Bird or beast upon the sculptured bust above his chamber door—
With such a name as ‘ Nevermore.’

“ But the Raven, sitting lonely, on that placid bust spake only
That one word, as if his soul, in that one word, he did outpour.
Nothing further then he uttered ; not a feather then he fluttered ;
Till I scarcely more than muttered, ‘ other friends have flown before ;
On the morrow *he* will leave me, as my hopes have flown before ;’
Then the bird said, ‘ Nevermore.’

“ Startled by the silence broken by reply so aptly spoken ;
 ‘ Doubtless,’ said I, ‘ what it utters is its only stock and store,
 Caught from some unhappy master, whom unmerciful disaster
 Followed fast, and followed faster, till his songs one burden bore—
 Till the dirges of his hope that melancholy burden bore
 Of ‘ never—nevermore.’ ”

‘ But the Raven still beguiling all my sad soul into smiling,
Straight I wheeled a cushioned seat in front of bird and bust and
door ;
Then, upon the velvet sinking, I betook myself to linking
Fancy into fancy, thinking what this ominous bird of yore—
What this grim, ungainly, ghastly, quaint, and ominous bird of yore
Meant in croaking ‘ Nevermore.’

"This I sat engaged in guessing, but no syllable expressing
To the fowl whose fiery eyes now turned into my bosom's core;
This, and more. I sat divining, with my head at ease reclining
On the cushion's velvet lining, that the lamp-light gloated o'er,
But whose velvet violet lining with the lamp-light gloating o'er,
 SAs shall press, ah, nevermore!

**"Then, methought the air grew denser, perfumed from an unseen
censer,
Swung by seraphim whose foot-falls tinkled on the tufted floor.**

'Wretch!' I cried, 'thy God hath lent thee—by these angels he
hath sent thee

Respite—respite and nepenthe from thy memories of Lenore!

Quaff, oh, quaff this kind nepenthe, and forget this lost Lenore!

Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore!'

" 'Prophet,' said I, 'thing of evil, prophet still, if bird or devil!

Whether tempter sent, or whether tempest tossed thee here ashore,

Desolate, yet all undaunted, on this desert land enchanted—

On this home, by horror haunted—tell me truly, I implore,—

Is there, is there balm in Gilead? tell me, tell me, I implore!

Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore!'

" 'Prophet,' said I, 'thing of evil, prophet still, if bird or devil!

By that heaven that bends above us—by that God we both adore—

Tell this soul with sorrow laden, if within the distant Aidenn

It shall clasp a sainted maiden, whom the angels call Lenore—

Clasp a rare and radiant maiden, whom the angels call Lenore.'

Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore!'

" 'Be that word our sign of parting, bird or fiend,' I shrieked, up-
starting,

'Get thee back into the tempest and the night's Plutonian shore!

Leave no black plume as a token of that lie thy soul hath spoken!

Leave my loneliness unbroken!—quit the bust above my door!

Take thy beak from out my heart, and take thy form from off my
door!'

Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore!'

" And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting

On the pallid bust of Pallas, just above my chamber door;

And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming,

And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his shadow on the
floor;

And my soul from out that shadow that lies flitting on the floor,
Shall be lifted nevermore."

Our readers will all agree with us in pronouncing this poem to be one of unquestionable merit. It exhibits a truly extraordinary mastery over most of the difficulties of verse. The power of rhyme displayed in it has not been surpassed or even equalled in our time, except by the late Thomas Hood. The metre is, in the abstract, a very fine one; like all very fine metres, its movement once heard can never be forgotten; and it has the additional merit of being perfectly adapted to the subject; the cadence at the end of each stanza is, by itself, expressive of the calm and settled, and almost careless sorrow conveyed by the words. The phraseology is extremely colloquial, without being at all undignified; and the prevailing sentiment, though deeply mournful, and verging upon despair, is never unmanly in its tone. We have endeavoured, in our extracts, to take the high-water marks

of American poetry in its different kinds; and as in Mr. Read's "Closing Scene" we have the best example we could find of the passive or feminine phase of poetical feeling, so here we have the highest example which America has yet produced of that manliness of passion which will rather relieve itself by laughter than by tears. Nothing can be better in its way than the mechanism of this poem. The expression of the sentiment upon which the poem is founded is most elaborately wrought out; and no poetical aid that could have been thought of is wanting. Mr. Poe has written other poems, but none of them, in our opinion, is comparable to this. He has also published a number of tales, which are of a very extraordinary character. They deal mainly in the simply horrible and marvellous; but these common elements of effect are managed with such unusual power, and in such a peculiar manner, that they cease to be vulgar. In the recent death of this young poet and romancer America has suffered a loss which will be more appreciated fifty years hence than it is now.

We have now placed before our readers the very best blossoms out of the garden—a very wide one—of American verse. The number of "respectable" versifiers who have come into existence in America, during the last few years, is surprising. The fertility of the New World in the production of mediocre poets exceeds even that of our own land. Indeed, almost every American seems to be possessed of the "accomplishment of verse" to some considerable degree. But that American poets are deficient in the "faculty divine," which shews us thoughts, and feelings, and facts from a totally new point of view, and spiritually enriches us with the revelation of an individuality quite different from our own or any other with which we have hitherto become acquainted, must be abundantly manifest to those of our readers who possess the amount of originality which is requisite to enable them to recognise true originality in others. Unquestionable as is the merit of each of the four writers whom we have selected as being, to our mind, the best of the American poets, we must confess that it never rises to a higher mark than this—that their poetry equals first-class modern English poetry *in its own way*: that is to say, they have succeeded in producing repetitions—which are not necessarily imitations—of first-rate original poetry; but have never attained to the production of first-rate original poetry themselves.

In conclusion, let us throw together a few recommendations* which it seems especially desirable that American poets should follow, if they would ever rise above their present mediocrity, which is not tolerable to "gods or men," although, unfortu-

nately for the poets themselves, it is tolerated by women, and therefore by "columns."

Follow, in poetry, the artistic law of architecture, which adopts, perfects, and displays, with the utmost degree of ostentation, the essential, but nothing else. Unsuperfluity is the invariable effect and the most powerful means of expressing real passion; and it can never be too often repeated that, in a good poem, all the words must be *the* words; for true feeling, if it is able to express itself at all, does so with perfect accuracy and eloquence.

Do not write in metres that you do not understand. It is difficult to do full justice, even to the simplest metres; but we find now-a-days the merest novices in verse attempting to dance in fetters which could hardly be worn gracefully by the mightiest poets.

In choosing your subject, and in deciding upon your method of treating it, remember that simple nature is full of endless significance and symbolism; meaning within meaning, like—

"Laborious orient ivory, sphere in sphere;"

and that the great difficulty in art is not to infuse nature with significance; but to apprehend and express the significance of nature. To do this properly, demands that your imagination should have received the highest religious culture; otherwise you will fall foul either of Pietism or Pantheism—extremes which are equally fatal to the poet.

Bear in mind the vast responsibility of public utterance. It is bad to become, like Milton's devil, "a liar in four hundred mouths," or more, by speaking without regard to the truth of the universe, in the most ephemeral magazine or newspaper; but how greatly aggravated is the crime of him who, in hope at least, is writing for all time, and raising, for aught he cares, a standing miracle of iniquity—for such is the proper designation of certain "works of art" which we could name, but will not, lest we should be charged with bigotry.

In intellect, no less than in action, the way of life is narrow, and in intellect, far more than in action, the temptation to pursue "the broad way and the green" is mighty. But heavenly truth, like heavenly life, is found to be "exceeding broad" when we are once really in the fruition of it. "He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully; what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." We know the things that truly concern us, and in what Book they are to be sought; and "if any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this Book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this prophecy, God shall

take away his part out of the Book of Life." Again, "The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Such should be, such *must* be the true poet's words; for, bear well in mind, that finish in art is not a question of surface, but of essence; finished expression is nothing more nor less than perfectly *true* expression; and all want of finish is simply want of truth. "How forcible are right words!" exclaims Job; and he might, alas! have exclaimed, with almost equal justice, "How forcible are wrong words!"

Do not, however, fancy that the execution is the only stage of your work at which you are to pray for inspiration. The greatest labour and the deepest inspiration of a large work must come before what is commonly called its execution. It is far better that the execution of your idea should be imperfect, than that the idea itself should lack worth and adequate general development.

Beware of the modern tendency to be unartistically explicit. Be as explicit as you can consistently with that primary demand of your art, *extreme condensation and pregnancy*; but remember that poetical language is *representative and suggestive*, and not, like prosaic, or "scientific" language, *arbitrary and exhaustive*. In Swedenborg's "Heaven and Hell," where he describes the language of the angels, there are some passages which come nearer than any we have ever met with to a description of what poetical language ought to be:—

"This language is not learned artificially, but is inherent in every one; for it flows direct from their affection and thought. The sound of their speech corresponds to their affection, and the articulations of sound composing the words correspond to the ideas of their thought proceeding from their affection: and as their language corresponds to these, it likewise is spiritual, being in reality audible affection and speaking thought. Whoever attends to the subject may be aware that all thought proceeds from affection, and that the ideas of thought are various forms into which the common affection is distributed; for no thought or idea can possibly exist without affection, it being from this that it derives its soul and life. . . . The angelic tongue has nothing in common with human [prosaic] languages, except with certain words, the sound of which is derived from some affection. Since the speech of the angels corresponds to their affection, which belongs to their love, and the love that prevails in heaven is love to the Lord, and love towards the neighbour, it is evident how elegant and pleasing must be their discourse; for it not only affects the ears, but also the interiors of the minds of those who hear it. There was a certain spirit, remarkable for hardness of heart, with whom an angel was speaking, and who at length burst into tears: he said that he could not help it, for what he heard was love itself speaking; and that he had never wept before. The speech of the angels is also full

of wisdom, because it proceeds from their interior thought, and their interior thought is wisdom, as their interior affection is love. In their speech their love and wisdom are united, whence it is so full of wisdom that they are able to express by a single word what man cannot in a thousand."—*Heaven and Hell*, translated by S. Noble, pp. 94–96.

Above all things, let the modern poet take the commonplace warning to beware of self-conceit, which, if allowed to get possession of him, will stop the development of his faculties, and destroy the powers to the use of which he has already attained. This is the age of the priestcraft of the intellect. We have cast off the bondage of those who would have influenced us unduly, in the name of God; but we have assumed the chains of a worse servitude in humbling ourselves before men who preach in their own names, for their own glory. This is not the place for an appeal to the self-degrading worshippers of the "intellect"—a class of persons who are only less miserable than those who treat superior faculty and information with disrespect. Our word is to the "men of intellect" themselves; particularly to the men of that kind of intellect which owes its power to health and vigour of imagination. To these we say, Do not be led astray by the adulation of your foolish worshippers; take your popularity to pieces, and see what it is really worth. True fame must come from men who are your equals, or superiors, in gifts of mind; and these do not make their voices heard, until popularity which comes from those who are lower in the scale of intellect than yourself, has done with its loud and fitful blasts. To beseech you, with many arguments, to remember that he is the greatest who is, in heart as well as in work, the servant of all, would be to trespass upon the office of the Christian pastor; but there is one humiliating fact which we may here impress upon those who, justly or not, think themselves to be great among the teachers of others, and the glorifiers in verse, or otherwise, of the works of God. It is certain that the sense of truth and loveliness which makes you eloquent, is inferior in force to the sense of the same truth and loveliness which makes others *silent*. Hear the sentence of the most inspired man of modern times:—

•
"Men adroit

In speech, and for communion with the world
Accomplished, minds whose faculties are then
Most active when they are most eloquent,
And elevated most, when most admired.
Men may be found of other mould than these;
Who are their own upholders, to themselves
Encouragement, and energy, and will;
Expressing liveliest thoughts in lively words,

As native passion dictates. Others, too,
There are among the walks of homely life,
Still higher men, for contemplation framed;
Shy and unpractised in the strife of phrase;
Meek men, whose very souls, perhaps, would sink
Beneath them summoned to such intercourse.
Theirs is the language of the heavens, the power,
The thought, the image, and the silent joy:
Words are but under agents in their souls;
When they are grasping with their greatest strength
They do not breathe among them. This I speak
In gratitude to God, who feeds our hearts
For his own service, knoweth, loveth us,
When we are unregarded by the world."

ART. V.—*The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr ; with Essays on his Character and Influence.* By the Chevalier BUNSEN and Professors BRANDIS and LOEBELL. 2 vols. London, 1852.

THE name of Niebuhr has been long familiar to all English scholars. Nowhere, perhaps, have his historical inquiries met with a truer sympathy and appreciation than in England. Nowhere has he found at once more admiring and discriminating pupils. And there are very many who know but little of his writings directly, who are yet conversant with his name and the general character of his labours,—embalmed as they are in the affectionate and weighty words of Arnold, and associated with the widely-popular “Lays” of Macaulay.

Familiar, however, as Niebuhr’s name is, and popular as the fruits of his studies may be said to have become, there has been hitherto little known in England of his personal history. For all German readers, indeed, there were the ample means of this knowledge in the “*Leben’s Nachrichten über Barthold George Niebuhr*,” edited by the careful and kindly hands of his sister-in-law, Madame Hensler. But this work, in three large volumes, and presenting a mass of materials for a life, rather than being itself a *life* of the historian, was not inviting save to the student, and however much prized in Germany, was but little read in this country. We give a hearty welcome, therefore, to the above volumes. It is true that they cannot, any more than the German work, upon which they are founded, be properly termed a “*Life of Niebuhr*.” They do not aim to give us, in a complete and artistic form, the portrait of the Man and of the Student as he lived and studied. This is a task that still remains to be done, and that would well reward the doing. But they give us, in a more compact and readable form, the substance of the German work—the most interesting of the numerous letters which chiefly compose it, with the biographical notices of Madame Hensler condensed, and “a considerable amount of additional information.” The narrative portions are not interspersed everywhere among the letters, according to the prevalent custom of memoir writers, but they stand in separate detachments, at the head of each section of letters, arranged so as to apply to a separate section of the author’s life. This is, we think, a preferable mode of arrangement, and especially as serving more directly to discriminate the character of *memoirs* from *biography* in any true sense of the term. It is of great importance to preserve this distinction, but too apt to be forgotten. We rejoice, there-

fore, in any feature which tends more clearly to bring it out ; which more prominently marks the former, as they properly are only "Accounts of a Life"—what the French call "*Memoirs pour servir, &c.*;" materials from which afterwards the shapely and consummate edifice of the Life may be reared by the hand of the artist, but not by any means the Life itself.

Viewing the work in this, its true light, it is one rich in excellence. We do not know, indeed, any work of our time we should more earnestly desire to see in the hands of every student ; so instinct is it with all those noblest lessons which the student needs ; so bright with interest and meaning for him on every page. Nor is it in a merely biographical point of view by any means devoid of attraction. It presents us with a wide and varied feature, which, if it is but nakedly unfolded here and there, is yet largely illuminated by the author's own graphic powers of description, and the softened and tender lights of an unflinching sympathy with all that is most pure and beautiful in Life, Literature, and Art. We trace, with a somewhat vivid impression, the features of Niebuhr's parental home in Ditmarsh ; the singular depth and compass of his early studies ; the experiences of his British travel ; the vicissitudes and difficulties of his diplomatic career ; his earnest aspirations and untiring labours as a student ; and, above all, the high and noble principles that constantly animated him ; and his lovely and overflowing affectionateness as a son, a husband, and a father.

It is our intention in the present paper to exhibit, in some degree, this impression of Niebuhr, especially in those relations in which he has been hitherto least known among us. We shall be led also to advert to his special position and character as an historian, and the impulse which he so widely imparted to historical criticism ; but it is with the Man and the Student generally that we shall for the most part concern ourselves.

Barthold George Niebuhr was born at Copenhagen on the 29th of August 1776. His father, the well-known Carsten Niebuhr, the oriental traveller, was a man of great energy and simplicity of character, distinguished for political shrewdness, and earnestly devoted to geographical and historical studies. Of his mother there is little known. She seems, however, to have been a woman of education and refinement—delicate in health, and sensitive in temperament ; with warm and somewhat irritable affections, yet easily pacified, affectionate, and tender. Barthold obviously inherited from both his parents their characteristic qualities ;—his enthusiasm for geographical and historical lore, and a certain tenacity of disposition, from his father :

his depth and tenderness of feeling, and a certain impatience and hastiness of judgment from his mother, whom he is also said to have chiefly resembled in personal features.

His father, on his return from his Arabian travels, settled first in Copenhagen, and subsequently in Meldorf, the chief town of the province of Ditmarsh, to which he was made secretary. This remote home of his childhood left a strong influence both on the tastes and opinions of Niebuhr. Flat, marshy, and treeless, his youthful eye rested on no object of external beauty; a circumstance to which he attributed his long-continued insensibility to the charms of nature. The country, however, was rich in a certain historical interest, highly prized by Niebuhr. There still survived in the province, remnants of its old republican institutions which he studied with great curiosity. Every reader of his history must remember how familiarly his mind recurs to these relics of Ditmarshian republicanism, in his efforts to throw light upon points in the ancient Roman constitution. The solitude of the place, with only his books and his father to guide his studies, helped also strongly to nourish in him that habit of independent inquiry which was the spring of all his future distinction. He learned, as a mere boy, that bold self-confidence in the value of his studies which clung to him through life, and which, amid so much that might have permanently withdrawn his attention from them, led him ever to return to them with all the fondness of a first love, and all the energy of a paramount duty.

The boy early distinguished himself by his quickness and intelligence. His memory, which in mature life was so remarkable, displayed its strength from the very first. His father, writing to Eckhardt, his brother-in-law, when he was only six years old, says, "He studied the Greek alphabet only for a single day, and had no further trouble with it: he did it with very little help from me. The boy gets on wonderfully. Boje says he does not know his equal; but he requires to be managed in a peculiar way. May God preserve our lives and give us grace to guide him right."

The Boje mentioned in this letter of his father, exercised a lively and happy influence over the mind of the young student. He was prefect of the province, and at the same time a literary personage of some consequence, being editor of the "*Deutsches Museum*." He had an extensive library, rich in French and English, as well as German books, to which young Niebuhr had free access. He appears to have taken a warm interest in the boy's education; and to have sought to foster in him, above all, those æsthetic and poetic impulses, which were most likely to be neglected under the mere tuition of his father. In a letter

of Boje's, written in 1783, he thus speaks of his young friend and his studies:—"This reminds me of little Niebuhr. His docility, his industry, and his devoted love for me, procure me many a pleasant hour. A short time back I was reading 'Macbeth' aloud to his parents, without taking any notice of him, till I saw what an impression it made upon him. Then I tried to render it all intelligible to him, and even explained to him how the witches were only poetical beings. When I was gone, he sat down (he is not yet seven years old) and wrote it all out in seven sheets of paper, without omitting one important point, and certainly without any expectation of receiving praise for it: for when his father asked to see what he had written, and showed it to me, he cried for fear he had not done it well. Since then he writes down everything of importance that he hears from his father or me."

The intellectual activity of "little Niebuhr" appears certainly to have been of an extraordinary kind. Essays, poetical paraphrases from the classics, sketches of little poems, a translation of Poncet's Travels in Ethiopia, an historical and geographical description of Africa, written in 1789, when he was only eleven years of age, attest the wonderful excitement and varied range of his mental capacity. When only in his eighth year, he could without help read any English book; and from about the same period, he began to share in the warm interest in literature which prevailed in Germany towards the close of last century, and eagerly welcomed the appearance of any new work from the pens of Klopstock, Lessing, and Goethe. These are almost the verbal statements of his biographer, who continues:—"But that interest in politics which became the master spring of his life, was first awakened at about the age of eleven. It is said that when the war with Turkey broke out in the year 1789, it so strongly excited the child's mind, that he not only talked of it in his sleep at night, but fancied himself in his dreams reading the newspapers, and repeating the intelligence they contained about the war; and his ideas on these subjects were so well arranged, and founded on so accurate a knowledge of the country, and the situation of the towns, that the realization of his nightly anticipations generally appeared in the journals a short time afterward."

The well-known poet Voss, who had married Boje's sister, occasionally visited Meldorf at this time. The great scholar speedily discovered Niebuhr's wonderful talents, and gave him all assistance he could in his classical studies. Amid causes of subsequent estrangement, the latter never forgot the kindness which he owed to the author of "Luise."

The remarkable attainments of the boy seem to have attracted

much attention about this period among the learned visitors of his father and Boje. In the conversations which took place among them, "he was frequently called upon," it is said, "to take a part, (being only eleven or twelve years of age,) and not seldom information was asked of him regarding geographical, statistical, historical, and other subjects, and given in a manner which excited their astonishment. His statistical knowledge was even then extraordinary: he was frequently assiduously engaged in subjects of this nature, such for instance as writing out lists of mortality."

The boy's character, in less favourable circumstances, could hardly have escaped the evil effects of such premature excitement. But his extreme natural simplicity, combined with the example of his father, and frequent expressions on the part of his mother, showing how little she valued these things, effectually protected him from all tendency to vanity. There was, besides, a depth as well as quickness of apprehension in him, which even now, as so strikingly in later years, could not brook any mere superficial display.

In his thirteenth year Niebuhr went to the Gymnasium at Meldorf. In a letter from his father dated 1788, he says,— "Barthold has not troubled his head so much about the Turks and the Emperor for some time past, but has made up his mind to enter the highest class at Easter, and is therefore busily engaged with the history of literature. He revels so in the Latin authors that I am almost obliged to restrain his ardour." He very soon outstripped his fellow-scholars, and acquired all he could at the Gymnasium. The Principal, Dr. Jüger, however, offered to advance his studies privately, and prepare him for the University,—an offer which was gladly accepted. He read with him the most difficult passages of the Greek and Latin authors, and gave him hints which enabled him to perfect his acquaintance with them. His industry was amazing. "More than half the day he gave to hard work, some hours to general reading, and a very short time to recreation and social pleasures."

All this intellectual exertion was undoubtedly excessive, and could not have failed to prove injurious, save from the rare strength and elasticity of Niebuhr's mental capacity. His studies were also at this time, as he himself afterwards complained, diffused over too wide and desultory a field. Still the finely balanced power and tone of his mind enabled him to pass comparatively unharmed through disadvantages which might have seriously retarded the progress of others; while there is undoubtedly something very noble in the mere absorbing ardour of his studious devotion. We do not know of a more impressive example of strenuous self-culture from the earliest years

—of a youth devoted with such pure zeal and unconscious simplicity of aim to intellectual and moral discipline.

The French Revolution of 1791 deeply affected him, but not as it did so many young minds of that period. It was even at this early age not so much the bright as the dark side of that great event on which his mind dwelt. Friend as he was of liberty, he was imbued with so passionate a love of order, that he was no less prone now than in later years to see beneath the revolutionary assertion of popular rights all the horrors of anarchy and popular tyranny.

In the year 1792, Niebuhr went to Hamburgh to school. Here he formed the friendship of Klopstock and the geographer Ebeling; and his residence amid a wider and more varied circle both of men of letters and youth of his own age, than he had hitherto enjoyed, promised him many advantages, which would have been of great service to him in some parts of his future career; but taken with vehement home-sickness, he returned to his father's house after only three months' absence.

The two subsequent years were spent at Meldorf in a similar round of study as before. The modern languages especially engaged his attention. Already familiar with French, English, and Italian, he now applied himself particularly to acquire Spanish and Portuguese. Here is the somewhat frightful catalogue given by his father in 1807 of the languages he then knew:—"1. German, as his mother-tongue, he learned at school; 2. Latin; 3. Greek; 4. Hebrew; and besides, in Meldorf, he learned, 5. Danish; 6. English; 7. French; 8. Italian; but only so far as to be able to read a book in these languages: some books from a vessel wrecked on the coast induced him to learn, 9. Portuguese; 10. Spanish; of Arabic he did not learn much at home, because I had lost my lexicon, and could not quickly replace it. In Kiel and Copenhagen he had opportunities of practice in speaking and writing French, English, and Danish; in Copenhagen he learnt, 11. Persian, (of Count Ludolph, the Austrian minister, who was born at Constantinople, and whose father was an acquaintance of mine;) and 12. Arabic, he taught himself; in Holland he learnt, 13. Dutch; and again in Copenhagen he learnt, 14. Swedish, and a little Icelandic; at Memel, 15. Prussian; 16. Slavonic; 17. Polish; 18. Bohemian; and 19. Illyrian; with the addition of Low German, this makes in all twenty languages."

In 1794 Niebuhr commenced his studies at the university of Kiel. The society into which he there entered proved a source of great enjoyment to him. With the aged Professor Hensler he contracted a particular intimacy, and in his house first made the acquaintance of Madame Hensler, (the Professor's daughter-in-

law,) who was destined to exercise so strong an influence on the whole future course of his life. She is described as "a woman of strong and healthy mind, with much decision of character, combined with deep feeling, and no ordinary cultivation—one of those women whose clear and correct judgment and ever ready sympathy render them through life the persons to whom all their friends instinctively turn for advice and assistance." At Kiel, as in his father's house, philology and history continued to be our Student's favourite pursuits. The Greek and Roman classics were now so familiar to him that he only indulged himself in such reading as a recreation. He was so thoroughly imbued with their spirit, that he may be said to have lived more easily in the world disclosed by them, than in the actual world around him. The ancient classical life in its great facts and features was realized by him with a vividness such as no one, we fancy, ever excelled or perhaps equalled. In that old Ethnic world he dwelt familiarly as an inhabitant—pleased with its joys and responsive to its sorrows. "He once told a friend who had called on him and found him in great emotion, that he often could not bear to read more than a few pages at a time in the old tragic poets; he realized so vividly all that was said and done and suffered, by the persons represented. He could see Antigone leading her blind father—the aged Oedipus entering the grove—he could catch the music of their speech, and felt certain that he could distinguish the true accent of the Greeks, though he could not reproduce it with his barbarian tongue."

At this time, too, he gave himself with considerable zeal to the study of philosophy, especially the system of Kant, then expounded in the University with great enthusiasm by Reinhold. The abstruse subtleties of the metaphysics of his country do not seem, however, now, or at any time, to have had much charm for Niebuhr. He appears himself to have been conscious of his inaptitude for them. We miss that hearty intelligence about his allusions to philosophy which distinguish his allusions to his other studies. The Concrete in life or in history had alone surpassing interest for him, and only in the contemplation and comprehension of it did his mind find full gratification, or show its full strength. Those merely intellectual difficulties, which the transcendental philosophy sought to resolve, scarcely discover themselves throughout all his letters, written as they often were amid the thick of metaphysical contention around him. History—the more he sought to apply himself to philosophy—appeared to him as his true vocation. "History," he says, "grows dearer and dearer to me, so much so, that my ardour in reading history interferes with my zeal for philo-

sophy, while no philosophy can blunt my inclination for history."

The series of his letters begin with his residence at Kiel. Their interest at this early stage consists almost entirely in the light which they throw upon his studies. He had begun already to indulge some original speculations respecting ancient history. The following extract from a letter to his parents, dated Kiel, 7th June 1794, explains in some degree the nature of these speculations:—

"I have not as yet fully explained to anybody but Hensler, my ideas about the colonization of Greece and the whole of Asia Minor, including Armenia from the west. For the peopling of the rest of Asia, I assume, 1. the Aramaic, or Assyrian race, to which belong the Arabs, Jews, Syrians, Assyrians, Chaldees, and Medes, of more or less pure descent; 2. the Indo-Persic; 3. the Tartar; 4. the Mongol; 5. probably the Chinese race. Taking this as a basis, we can proceed further, and shall obtain everywhere at last the same result, viz., that these great national races have never sprung from the growth of a single family into a nation, but always from the association of several families of human beings, raised above their fellow-animals by the nature of their wants, and the gradual invention of a language, each of which families probably had originally formed a language peculiar to itself. This last idea belongs to Reinhold. By this I explain the immense variety of languages among the North American savages, which it is absolutely impossible to refer to any common source, but which, in some cases, have resolved themselves into one language, as in Mexico and Peru for instance; and also the number of synonyms in the earliest periods of languages. On this account I maintain, that we must make a very cautious use of differences of languages, as applied to the theory of races, and have more regard to physical conformation, which latter is exactly the same, for instance, in most of the Indian tribes of North America."—Vol. i. pp. 38, 39.

We add to this the following noble words from a letter of a few months' later date—words which, as they reveal so clearly the genuine spirit of self-culture which animated young Niebuhr, well deserve the earnest attention of every student:—

"Knowledge, what is commonly called learning, mere dull memory-work, will never be the aim of my exertions. The one thing needful is to cultivate one's understanding for one's self, so as to render it capable of production. He who merely crams himself with the conceptions of other men's minds, clothed in forms foreign to his own nature, will never accomplish much. Quiet and independent energetic industry can alone attain to what is true, and bring forth what is really useful."

While at Kiel Niebuhr largely extended his literary acquaint-

ance, not only among the professors and students, but within a circle composed of some of the most highly gifted men of the time—then resident at Holstein. “The little city of Eutin, delightfully situated on the wooded shores of an extensive lake, about twenty miles from Kiel, formed a sort of centre to this circle.” Here, or in the immediate neighbourhood, lived the two brothers Stolberg. Here were also Jacobi, and Voss, (Niebuhr’s old acquaintance,) who was rector of the Gymnasium of the place. Of these illustrious men, Jacobi perhaps exercised the greatest influence over him. There was a purity and elevation about the philosopher’s character which lent a softening and impressive wisdom to all his discourse, peculiarly attractive to Niebuhr. There was the same moral earnestness in both—the same love for the ideally beautiful in life and manners which, as it at once drew them together, formed a bond of union between them which was only broken by death. Of Voss, Niebuhr’s admiration was at this time at the highest point. To his friend Count Moltke he unbosoms himself regarding him with an enthusiasm which, while very characteristic of the writer, is not without interest in reference to the subject. Count Adam Moltke, we should observe, was one of Niebuhr’s dearest friends at this period and afterwards. He formed his acquaintance during the second year of his college-life, and the warmest attachment speedily sprung up betwixt them—an attachment to which Niebuhr’s letters everywhere testify. To him he thus writes, on 4th August 1795, of Voss, whose “*Luise*,” he says, had lately afforded him such “unequalled enjoyment,” that he could not help inviting his friend also to contemplate and admire it.

“He (Voss) may be, (and will be, perhaps, for after ages,) to Germany what Homer and the most perfect of the Greek poets were to their nation. Did he meet with such a reception as they found among their unrivalled fellow-countrymen—were his idyls publicly recited to the people, and his songs sung in popular assemblies, how much might such a teacher accomplish! He would effect more that was really good and great than *the only true philosophy*, should that ever be discovered. I should like to prescribe Voss and Lessing for you and myself, as our exclusive mental aliment. Voss forbids every author but Lessing, whom he deems perfect, except that he wants rhythm; he did not, indeed, name himself as the second, but no doubt he knows what he is, and would despise the false modesty of refusing to confess it on a fitting occasion. Forsake even Klopstock, and measure yourself by the severe standard of these men; such, at least, is my resolution. Not without reason do I speak thus warmly of ‘*Luise*.’ It has done what a book scarcely ever did before—drawn tears of delight from my eyes. It is a striking example, that to move the reader most deeply, the author must be in perfect repose, and the style of his whole work calm and mellowed.

We can never sufficiently study and examine this late-born Greek. I, at least, with Homer, Sophocles, Æschylus, Pindar, Horace, and him, would willingly resign all the other poets in the world; yet this is too hastily written—I could not relinquish Theocritus, and that German-Greek Gessner. It will seem strange to you, perhaps even ridiculous, that I should pass over Klopstock. It has cost me much to do so, but if strict justice be done, I fear he will not stand before the Greek tribunal. I must except the most finished of his odes, which Alcæus himself need not blush to acknowledge, were they ascribed to him, and also the ‘Republic of the Learned,’ a thoroughly German work. But, then, alas! the ‘Messiah!’ This rigid justice is a sacrifice, and as you know how I revere this great creator, or rather resuscitator of our literature, you will appreciate it as it deserves. I have sat at his feet, and am at least not ungrateful.”—Vol. i. pp. 55, 56.

In 1796 Niebuhr received, through Dr. Hensler, the offer of the post of private secretary to the Danish Minister, Count Schimmelmann. His friends strongly urged him to accept the offer, and, with his father’s consent, he did so, although for a limited period, that he might afterwards be at liberty to pursue his studies abroad. Before entering upon his duties, he spent some weeks with his parents at Meldorf, accompanied by his friend Moltke, and, while there, paid a visit to Dr. Behrens, the prefect of North Dithmarsh, and the father of his friend Madame Hensler. Here he renewed his acquaintance with Madame Hensler’s younger sister, to whom he had been already introduced, and, becoming deeply impressed with her nobleness and worth, yielded to the first impulse of that attachment in which his future happiness was so deeply involved.

His present residence in Copenhagen, which continued till 1798, was not marked by any events of importance. His duties interested him, and no doubt laid the foundation of his future diplomatic attainments; but the distractions attendant on his residence in Count Schimmelmann’s house were by no means welcome. This led him to accept the office of supernumerary secretary at the Royal Library, with no salary at first, but with permission to travel abroad after a time. In 1797 he returned to Kiel on a visit, and meeting there again, in the house of Dr. Hensler, with Amelia Behrens, his attachment to her ripened into a deep and unconquerable passion. In October of the same year he was betrothed to her—a fact which he announces to his friend Moltke in the following letter:—

“Kiel, October 1797. •

“Dora (Madame Hensler) and I send you and your wife this messenger, because we cannot bear to wait several days before writing to you, especially as our letter would be a long time on the road;

so you will receive this before another that Dora wrote to you two days ago, which announced as close at hand what has now really taken place. I am in far too great an agitation to say much. Each of you take one of our letters; Dora's will tell you the most. Yesterday evening, at Dora's house, Amelia decided in my favour. Her heart had already decided. Love can distinguish between truth and pretence. She assumed no girlish affectation when Dora gave words to feelings that had before scarcely expressed themselves, and joined our hands. This pure simplicity, this Roman decision in a gentle heart, made my happiness perfect. . . . I know that I have earnestly endeavoured not to deceive Milly. In our conversations when we met, I spoke to her from my inmost heart, and took pains to discover to her what, if concealed, might have deceived her, and made her very unhappy hereafter; for I thought myself bound not to deny what still clings to me from former evil times, as a stain to be washed out; but I hope to God that happiness, and the power of love, this new unknown force, and, above all, the contemplation of the proud joy in her angelic heart, and an openness that will rather gain than lose through absence, will purify me before we can be united—for absence is before us."

In the close of the same letter he thus characteristically describes his betrothed:—

"Milly has a Roman character, and this was always my idea of a citizen's wife; pride, intellect, the most retiring modesty, unbounded love, constancy, and gentleness. In history we only meet with such women among the Roman matrons,—the Calpurnias, Portias, Arrias. Soft, weak, tender girlishness, would neither have elevated nor strengthened my character."—Pp. 68-70.

At this period Niebuhr's favourite wish was a professorship at Kiel, where he hoped to lead a quiet and studious life suited to his disposition. It cannot be doubted, on a review of his career, that such a situation was the one for which he was above all others fitted, and where his highest happiness would have been found. His experience subsequently, both in Berlin and Bonn, amply establish this. When we think of what we owe to these comparatively brief spaces of his life devoted to the quiet pursuit of the studies so dear to him, we are strongly inclined to lament the circumstances which turned him from the realization of his early wish. * The following letter, dated 24th August 1797, expresses his lofty sense of the qualifications requisite for such a professorship as that which he now contemplated:—

"In order fully to understand and to give lectures upon ancient literature, and ancient history, which forms a part of it, it is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary that I should have read through all the ancient writings still extant, at least once, with the closest attention—the more important works many times—and acquired a living and

familiar acquaintance with each period. There may possibly be some exceptions to this rule in the case of special sciences, which must for ever remain a mystery to the uninitiated. This undertaking was carried out by Milton long ago. There would scarcely be found many to do it now, but it seems to me that it is what I undoubtedly ought to attempt.

“A profound and practical acquaintance with the grammar of the two classical languages must be obtained, partly by means of the various treatises on that subject, and partly from the literature of the languages themselves. A systematic philosophy, as the groundwork of all settled convictions and all accurate thought; what is perhaps still more important, method in thinking, writing, and studying; added to these, various exercises in the art of composition, and a thorough command of our mother-tongue, are indispensable requisites for any one who steps forth before the public, and seeks to obtain a high standing. It is no more than a man demands of himself.

“These, then, are the preliminary tasks that I should have to execute, before I could accept a professorship in Kiel without a blush, and discharge its duties without disgracing or overworking myself.”—Vol. i. p. 82.

In June 1798 Niebuhr set out to spend some time of study and travel in England and Scotland. In his letters to his betrothed we have an interesting though imperfect record of his views and impressions during this period. They are marked by considerable acuteness of observation, and touch often, with a very keen probe, some traits of our national character; but they are often also one-sided and exaggerated. His father's name introduced him largely into society, but there were obviously some aspects of our social life of which he saw nothing, or at any rate understood little. He found little to interest him in the mere external appearance of London. A dinner at the Royal Society he characterizes, as “a feast, and the conversation extremely indifferent.” Of the style of conversation generally he says: “The superficiality and insipidity of nearly all the conversations to which I have listened, or in which I have joined, is really depressing. As far as I hear, little is said about politics, which is a good thing—much better than our German mania for going beyond our depth on such subjects; but that narrative and commonplaces form the whole staple of conversation, from which all philosophy is excluded,—that enthusiasm and loftiness of expression are entirely wanting, depresses me more than any personal neglect of which, as a stranger, I might have to complain.” He finds “mediocrity very common, and by no means looked down upon,” and thinks that “the most learned men here, as elsewhere, look more to the authority that a man brings with him than to his talents or intellect.” For English scholarship he has little regard. The libraries were naturally his

chief sources of interest. "Vauxhall, Ranelagh, Astley's, the Royal Circus, &c., &c., were scarcely worth the money and the time." St. Paul's did not draw from him any expression of admiration; and, while looking with reverence and gratitude on the busts of so many great men in Westminster Abbey, he could not help adding, "How characteristic is the equally honourable position accorded to so many nameless and insignificant persons by the side of the noblest dead! What a quantity of nonsense is to be seen on these venerable walls! One man writes a Hebrew inscription on the tomb of his daughter; on another, I think also belonging to a woman, there is an Abyssinian inscription; Chatham has an absurdly overburdened allegorical monument; Sidney and Russell have none at all; and on Milton's, the man who erected it gives his own name and title in several lines—Milton is mentioned in the quietest manner."

On his arrival in Edinburgh he entered the University as a student, and the experience of his first day's attendance upon the introductory lectures leaves him convinced beyond all doubt that the reputation of the University was fully deserved, and that the professors were all he could wish, "as men of profound insight, thorough mastery over their subject, and admirable delivery." He found Edinburgh incredibly cheap in comparison with London—cheaper even than Copenhagen. Fashion did not restrict as in London. "The natives of every class were distinguishable, not to their advantage, by the carelessness of their attire, and the students as far removed from English neatness" as young Germany. He describes very pleasantly his intercourse with the family of an old friend of his father's—Francis Scott. He is particularly struck with the "piety of the Scotch." "They not only go to church every Sunday, but to both the services; and all, high and low, conclude the day of rest with prayer and singing." He alludes more than once to this feature of the national character in a way that shows his respect for it, although at the same time betraying his inability to sympathize with it. He does not think highly of our philosophical talent. The praise bestowed upon it by Jacobi he considers undeserved. Among the students especially he found the French materialistic philosophy prevailing. It is interesting to remark what he says of the characteristic idea entertained of his countrymen:—

"Formerly," he observes, "our learned men were regarded as very slow, narrow-minded fellows; now people are inclined to pronounce them very clever men, but to look upon them as so many conspirators against the peace of the world; an opinion that is adopted, in a still more incomprehensible manner, by some young profligates, and

excites their delight as much as it does the abhorrence of other people. One of these asked me with great astonishment, 'Are you speaking earnestly? We thought that the German men of letters were without exception atheists, and we admire you on that account.'

It is also very curious to observe how his German *Innigkeit* (heartiness) felt itself on all sides painfully restrained by our social conventionalism. His many remarks on this subject are pointed with a good deal of sharp truth, although here, as often, he runs into extravagance.

He tarried in Edinburgh altogether less than a year; and after a short excursion into East Lothian, (not having been able to carry into effect his intention of visiting the Highlands,) he returned to Holstein, and spent the winter of 1799-1800 there with his friends. In April he set out for Copenhagen, where he received a warm welcome from Schimmelman; and a few weeks after his arrival was appointed assessor at the Board of Trade for the East India department, and secretary and head clerk of the Standing Commission of the affairs of Barbary, with a small salary. A professorship was still in his thoughts; but when in the autumn of this year it was eventually offered him, he decided in the meantime for public life. In May he returned to Holstein, and married. In a letter to Madame Hensler, written in the following August, he describes in the most glowing terms his happiness. "Happiness," he says, "is a poor word; find a better."

He intended at this time to devote his leisure hours to German history, but his studies were interrupted, first, by the ill health of his wife, and then by the threatening aspect of affairs in the Danish capital. Amid all the distractions of his present position, however, he continued to prosecute his studies in one form or another. He studied Arabic, and began a treatise on the Roman laws of property and the history of the agrarian laws, in which he appears to have started the clue of some of his subsequent investigations into Roman history.

In 1804 he was appointed first director of the bank, and, practically, the only acting member of the directory. He also became a member of the Standing Commission for the affairs of Barbary, of which he had hitherto acted as secretary. These changes, of course, very much improved his standing and income.

Towards the end of 1805 overtures were made to him by the Prussian Government. After some delay and negotiation he acceded to these overtures, although with considerable reluctance. A heart so warmly affectionate as Niebuhr's felt deeply the separation from his many friends in Denmark. The fearful

struggle, too, at this time obviously impending over Prussia, did not help to lighten the prospect before him. Still, having fairly embarked on a political career, he naturally sought a wider field and a higher reward for his conspicuous talents.

He arrived at Berlin on the 5th of October 1806. The disasters of the Prussian army at Jena, Auerstadt, and Halle, &c., immediately followed his arrival. The victorious French were advancing on Berlin. In the consternation of the moment, the Prussian authorities surrendered one after another. Many of the ministers, even, yielding to the panic, took the oath of fidelity to the French Commissioners without communication with the King. Stein formed a noble exception, and, under his direction, Niebuhr set out to Stettin with the money belonging to the various offices under his charge. From Stettin he continued his journey to Dantzic. The surrender of the latter town in a few days rendered necessary a retreat to Königsberg, and the continued advance of the army finally compelled him to take refuge in Memel, whither the Royal family had gone, followed by the remanent members of the Government, and the treasury chests.

Stein having received his dismissal from the Prussian monarch, Niebuhr was resolved to send in his resignation also; and for some time he remained undecided as to his future career. He was ultimately induced, however, to remain at his post, in the prospect of Count Hardenberg, or even Baron von Stein, being recalled to office. On the former being entrusted with the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, in 1807, he called Niebuhr to his assistance, and set him at the head of the financial department of the Commissariat. Leaving his wife ill at Memel, he repaired to head-quarters at Bartenstein. The hardship and anxiety, which had already prostrated the weaker health of his wife, now overcame himself. He was attacked with typhus fever, and remained for some time in great danger. Want of attention, and the depression arising from his utter loneliness, prolonged his illness. His deep dejection betrays itself in his letters to his wife. Amid the harassing hardships of the public life in which he was engaged he looks back with a fond regret on his historical studies. "I belong to those," he says, "who must have freedom for the soul and intellect; and for this very reason I ought not to have entered on the restraints of official life. I am often seized with regret when I think of my beautiful researches into history; my happy meditations on dark periods; my power of bringing them vividly before my mind's eye; my life in antiquity. Where is all this gone? Shall I ever renew it? Shall I ever be able to restore it to fresh life?"

Continued disasters compelled the retreat of the Prussian

Government still northwards; and in July 1807 we find Niebuhr in Riga, in great anxiety and uncertainty. "We cannot describe our grief," he writes to Madame Hensler, "for our expressions might be watched in several quarters; we have often expressed them to you before, and now we have nothing but helpless wishes. Oh that the storm might disperse, that we might meet once more on the undesecrated, uninjured soil of our fatherland!" Yet amid all the anxious toil and sorrow which now preyed upon him, we find him unflagging in his studies. He avails himself of the opportunity to study the Russian and Slavonic languages, and earnestly defends his endeavour to do so in a letter to Madame Hensler, who would seem to have remonstrated with him on what she conceived an unnecessary diversion of his time.

On the 12th of July tidings reached Riga that peace was concluded. So painfully discouraged was Niebuhr by the acknowledged subjection of his country, that he sent a request for his dismissal to one of his colleagues, to be transmitted to the king. His Majesty, however, having expressed himself reluctant to part with his services, he was induced to continue them, and to comply with the Royal request to repair to Memel. Stein having returned to office, he employed Niebuhr to conduct a difficult negotiation with the Dutch capitalists for a loan; and with this view he set out, after a brief visit to his friends in Denmark, (having been met in Berlin by the intelligence of the death of his mother,) with his wife to Amsterdam. Great difficulties having occurred in the negotiation, Niebuhr was instructed to remain at Amsterdam; and in July 1808 was formally accredited as Prussian Minister at the Court of Holland.

Meanwhile, Stein, discovered in his patriotic project for the deliverance of Germany, was proscribed by Napoleon; and in the confusion resulting from the change of Government, Niebuhr sought a quiet refuge for a little with his relatives in Ditmarsh. Here he spent the greater part of the summer of 1809, but was at length summoned to Königsberg, where the Court and Government were still resident, to resume his public duties. During this renewed period of official activity, under Count Altenstein, his health again gave way, and he fell into a still deeper dejection than before, in the contemplation of his country's wrongs and sufferings. Placed, however, at the head of the department for the management of the national debt and the monetary institutions, his incessant employment served, in some degree, to dissipate his gloomy thoughts.

On the resignation of the Altenstein ministry, and the accession of Count Hardenberg to office, Niebuhr, distrusting the latter and dissenting from his principles of administration, re-

quested his Majesty to release him from his post, and give him an appointment in the University about to be opened in Berlin. After some delay, his request was acceded to, and he was appointed historiographer in place of Johannes von Müller, on the condition, however, that he should assist Count Hardenberg and the Minister of Finance with his opinions and advice when required.

His letters during this period of his life, of which we have presented so slight a summary, are full of interest. They have, however, less purely literary attraction than those of the previous and later periods of his life—the continual vicissitudes and occupations of his official position having left him but little leisure for those studies to which his heart so closely clung. Expressions of mournful bitterness as to his fate in this respect occasionally escape him. “I feel,” he says in a letter to Madame Hensler, “very seriously, and even depressingly, the effects of the last three years, during which my life has been constantly unsettled, and my movements determined by others. Such a life has no inward vitality; it is like a flower plucked from its parent stem—it fades, and leaves no seed behind.” “Instead of poetry, archæology, and ancient history,” he writes to Moltke, “I have had to cultivate finance, banking, administration—all of which between ourselves are—(compared to my brave old comrades)—a set of beggarly fellows that sometimes almost drive me mad, especially when anything reminds me strongly of all those whom I have lost.”

Niebuhr, now in his 34th year, entered for a short time upon those academic duties, for which there can exist no doubt he was singularly qualified. During all the hardships and changes of his public life we have seen that his heart was still in his early philological and historical studies. That it was truly in this field his special destination and his highest labour and honours lay, is very evident from the following sketch of work he had prescribed for himself in it before this period. There can be no doubt that this is no mere note of vague projects never seriously contemplated, but that his mind had actually pondered and mastered most of the subjects indicated.

Works which I have to complete—

1. Treatise on Roman Domains.
2. Translation of El Wakidi.
3. History of Macedon.
4. Account of the Roman Constitution at its various epochs.
5. History of the Achæan Confederation, of the Wars of the Confederates, and of the Civil Wars of Marius and Sylla.
6. Constitutions of the Greek States.
7. Empire of the Caliphs.

The University of Berlin was opened in 1810. The most illustrious names of Germany in all departments of knowledge were associated with it—Schleiermacher, Savigny, Buttmann, and Heindorf. Niebuhr's post did not necessarily attach him to the University; but, at the suggestion of his friend Spalding, he resolved to give a course of lectures on Roman History, in connexion with it. These lectures formed the foundation of his great historical work. In the beginning of September he writes to Madame Hensler:—

“I have determined to give a course of lectures on the History of Rome. I would never have undertaken to write the history of Rome, but to lecture on it is a somewhat less rash undertaking. I shall begin with the primitive state of Italy, and, as far as possible, represent the ancient races, not only from the narrow point of view of their subjugation, but also as they were in themselves, and as they had been in their earlier stages; then, in the Roman history, I shall give an account of the constitution and administration, of which I have a vivid picture before my mind's eye. I should like to bring this history down to the latest era, when the forms developed from the germs of antiquity became utterly extinct, and those of the middle ages took their place.”—Vol. i. pp. 302, 303.

The success of Niebuhr's lectures was remarkable: “In addition to a large audience of students, they were attended by members of the Academy, Professors of the University, public men, and officers of all grades, who spread the fame of the lectures abroad, and thus continually attracted fresh hearers.” He was very powerfully affected by these signs of his success. The interest he had previously felt in his subject was greatly heightened by the warm appreciation of his labours, and his daily familiar intercourse with distinguished scholars. Savigny thus speaks of his delivery: “He had written down his lecture *verbatim*, and read it off before his hearers. This proceeding, which usually injures the liveliness of the impression, had, in his case, the most animated and powerful effect, such as in general only accompanies an extempore delivery. His hearers felt as if transported into ancient times, when the public reading of new books supplied the place of our printed books, and there was a less extended circulation, but they made a warmer and more personal impression.” Savigny was one of those scholars to whom Niebuhr considered himself in the highest degree indebted for sympathy and co-operation in his peculiar studies: he acknowledges his obligations to him in the preface to his History; and, in a note, speaks of him with the highest respect and admiration.

There can be little doubt, we think, that this period of Niebuhr's residence in Berlin was about the happiest of his life.

He was engaged exactly in the task for which Nature had most fitted him; he found rare gratification in the full exercise of his intellectual powers; he was touched and stimulated by the flattering success with which his lectures met; he was surrounded by the most highly gifted and sympathizing society.

“With a little more quiet,” he himself writes, “my position would be more completely in accordance with my wishes than I have long ventured even to hope for. There is such a real mutual attachment between my acquaintance and myself, and our respective studies give such an inexhaustible interest to conversation, that I now really possess in this respect what I used to feel the want of. The lectures themselves, too, are inspiring, because they require persevering researches, which I venture to say cannot remain unfruitful to me, and they are more exciting than mere literary labours, because I deliver them with the warmth inspired by fresh thoughts and discoveries, and afterwards converse with those who have heard them, and to whom they are as new as to myself. This makes the lectures a positive delight to me.”

To complete the social happiness of his present position, he formed, along with Schleiermacher, Buttman, Heindorf, and others, a select Philological Society, which met once a week at the houses of the several members by rotation, for the purpose of reading and correcting some classical author.

About the close of his first series of lectures he put to press the first volume of his History. He thus contemplates the publication:—

“I am now approaching the conclusion of my lectures, and the printing is about to commence. I begin it with a thorough consciousness of what is in my book, and of the rank it will hold at some future day; but I am not quite easy as to its immediate reception, partly because I am aware that the execution might and ought to be improved in many respects; partly because no one is allowed to bring forward novelties before our public with impunity, however clearly their correctness may be proved. Then I have already enjoyed for the most part the reception given to it by affection from Savigny and other friends; that of disapprobation is still to come. *I have written with such strict conscientiousness—not merely with regard to the praise and blame I have dispensed, but also with respect to the historical researches—that I could die on this book.* It certainly will furnish little reading for recreation, and I confess that by the side of many passages successful in point of style, there are others very awkward and stiff. *The great merit of this book lies in the criticism of history, and in the light thrown on many insulated points of the constitution, laws,*” &c.—Vol. i. p. 320.

—A singularly acute and discriminating judgment, as we shall afterwards endeavour to point out.

In 1811 Goethe's Autobiography appeared, and with Niebuhr,

as with all interested in German literature, formed a topic of much attraction and talk. Looking forward to it, he says,—

“ So Goethe's *Life* is out, and I shall have it in a few days. It always gives me a melancholy feeling when a good man writes his life. It is already evening with him then, and that he relates how he lived, shews that he no longer lives quite from the root.”

After its perusal he thus expresses his opinion of it :—

“ When it came into my head to say to you that autobiography in general was the song of the swan—and Goethe's no exception—I certainly made too sweeping an assertion. With him, at least, youth has been renewed by the contemplation of his youth ; and if he should write nothing like it again, he has written nothing like it for a long time past. The picture of his life is inimitably sweet and graceful. I feel sure that we cannot differ in our judgment of this book. The number of trifles it relates will not annoy you—you will fancy him narrating, and it is the peculiar charm of his style, that you can really feel as if he were telling you the whole. The story of his first love is exquisitely beautiful ; no second equal to it can occur in the history, and I should not be sorry if the book were to remain unfinished.”—Pp. 325, 326.

In connexion with this criticism it may be interesting to the reader to peruse Goethe's opinion of the first volume of Niebuhr's *History*. He writes to him on receiving a copy of it,—

“ Your discrimination of the poetical from the historical element is of inestimable worth, since by it neither is destroyed, but rather for the first time fully confirmed in its true value and dignity ; and there is an inexhaustible interest in seeing how the two again coalesce, and exert a mutual influence. It is much to be wished that all similar phenomena in the history of the world may be treated in the same method. Does it need many words to assure you that I have derived the utmost instruction from your development of the position of the state and of its finances, of its relations to Greece, of the anarchical condition of Rome after the expulsion of the kings ; in short, from all and every part ? Were I to go into detail, and to speak of your description of Ancus Martius, of your unveiling of the Sybilline books, or to dwell upon the poems of Lucretia and Coriolanus, I should have to write a book upon the book, and these sheets would never reach the post. Rest assured that you have sent me a noble gift, for which I shall all my life feel grateful to you ; that I am looking forward to the continuation with the greatest eagerness, and, in order to render myself worthy of it, am making your first volume thoroughly my own by the most diligent study.”—Vol. i. p. 328.

In the winter of 1811–12 Niebuhr continued his lectures. His audiences were much less numerous than in the preceding winter : still he found stimulus and enjoyment in his work. During the same period he busied himself with the preparation of the second volume of his *History*, which appeared in August 1812. He hoped to go on with the third volume immediately,

but overwork having injured his health, he was obliged to abandon his studies altogether for a while; and in the meantime the excitement attending the War of Liberation in Germany, and the new public duties consequently devolving upon him, combined, with the illness and death of his wife, to postpone for a long period the prosecution of his historical studies. Nothing, however, can exceed the enthusiasm with which at this period he dwells upon them. We see how predominantly he was a Student; how all his deepest longings were for a quiet life of intellectual labour; and how much we have really lost by the political distractions which seduced him from his proper field of occupation and duty.

"O! how would philology be divided," he writes to his friend Moltke, August 1812, "if people knew the magical delight of living and moving amidst the most beautiful scenes of the past! The mere reading is the smallest part of it; the great thing is to feel familiar with Greece and Rome during their most widely different periods. I wish to write history with such vividness—so to replace vague by well-defined images—so to disentangle confused representations, that the name of a Greek of the age of Polybius and Thucydides, or that of a Roman in the times of Cato or Tacitus, should instantly call up in the mind the fundamental idea of their character."—Vol. i. pp. 345, 346.

With the spring of 1813 Niebuhr was again actively employed in the political affairs of his country. He was engaged to negotiate with Lord Stewart regarding the subsidies to be advanced by England, and to draw up a commercial treaty between England and Prussia. In the beginning of 1814 we find him in Holland, with the same object of arranging subsidies with the English Commissioners. His journey to Holland at this time had a deeply injurious effect upon the already declining health of Madame Niebuhr. She was able, however, to accompany him once more on a visit to their friends in Holstein, after which he settled again in Berlin, deeply oppressed by the prospect of the evidently near termination of his domestic happiness and the general aspect of public affairs. In this state he received tidings of the death of his father.

In the spring of 1815 Madame Niebuhr grew rapidly worse, and on the 20th of June she expired in the arms of her husband—one of her parting expressions to him being, "You shall finish your History whether I live or die." This loss plunged him in the deepest affliction; and while he never ceased to bear in mind the request of his dying wife, he yet found it impossible in the meantime to resume his labours on Roman history. He turned aside, therefore, to other labours, chiefly of an historical kind. He composed the well-known life of his father—a graphic and interesting biography. He also continued his lea-

sons to the Crown Prince, whom he had begun the year before to instruct in Finance. Of the character of the Prince he gives the most flattering picture :—

“ I rejoice,” he says, “ when the day comes to go to him. He is attentive, inquiring, full of interest—all the noble gifts with which nature has so richly endowed him unfold themselves to me in the course of these lessons. We often wander from our reading into conversation, but not into idle talk, and it is no waste of time. His gaiety of disposition does not render him less earnest ; and his feelings are as deep as his fancy is playful. He seeks instruction and counsel from others, without surrendering himself to the authority of any. I have never seen a youth with a finer nature.”—Vol. i. p. 416.

Shortly after his wife's death a diplomatic mission to Rome was proposed to Niebuhr, which he considered it to be his duty to accept ; and among his other studies he busied himself during the following winter in preparing for it. In July of the next year he set out on his mission, having previously united himself again in marriage to a niece of Madame Hensler. He was accompanied by his friend Professor Brandis, as Secretary of Legation. On his way he visited Munich, and his aged friend Jacobi, as also the patriot Speckbacher, and the memorable scenes of the Tyrolese war. Professor Brandis gives a very interesting account of their interview with the patriot. On the 7th of October he reached Rome. He thus describes his feelings on entering the city in a letter to Madame Hensler :—

“ It was with solemn feelings that this morning, from the barren heights of the moory Campagna, I caught sight first of the cupola of St. Peter's, and then of the view of the city from the bridge, where all the majesty of her buildings and her history seems to lie spread out before the eye of the stranger ; and afterwards entered by the Porta del Popolo. I have already wandered through a part of the city, and visited the most famous of the ruins. My presentiment of the emotions with which I should behold them has proved quite correct. Nothing about them is new to me ; as a child I lay so often for hours together before the pictures I gave you as a keepsake, that their images were, even at that early time, as distinctly impressed upon my mind as if I had actually seen them ; then, besides, it repels me that all the remains are those of the imperial times, and it is impossible for an architectural work of art to speak to the feelings, if considered as isolated, and without connexion with other ideas. But the influence of the completely modern part of all that here surrounds you, and intrudes itself upon your attention, is most disturbing ; the glaringly bad taste of the churches of the last two hundred and fifty years ; the utter want of solemnity in all that meets the eye. In Petrarch's time, all must have made a profound impression of gran-

deur and magnificence on those who were susceptible to it; indeed, much that had but a short time since spoke to the sense of poetry, has now been destroyed by the clearing out of the rubbish from the Forum and the Colosseum. Now their walls and columns stand stripped and naked, corroded by time, despoiled of the luxuriant and wild vegetation which once flourished among the ruined stones. . . .

"But when one sees this favoured land, to which our most fruitful districts are barren; sees how, at Terni, two harvests of grain are reaped from the soil in one year,—one of wheat in June, and the maize soon after it in October; how this goes on year after year, and the wheat yields fifteen fold; when one sees how there is, strictly speaking, no peasant class at all here; how the very happiest places are those where the peasant only has to give up half the produce, and not where, as for many miles round Rome, all husbandry is performed by day-labourers under the enormously rich nobles; when you see the swarms of beggars who assure you, with looks that bear witness to the assertions, that they have not tasted bread to-day; when you hear what numbers have died of hunger, it does indeed raise bitter feelings. It has become perfectly clear to me how this misery arose in the imperial times, and has been rendered permanent by the German conquerors, who have in no respect made themselves benefactors to Italy."—Vol. ii. pp. 59, 60.

It ought perhaps to be mentioned that there was a famine in the year in which Niebuhr visited Rome, which served greatly to heighten the unfavourable character of his first impression. So grievous was the suffering of the people, that Professor Brandis relates "how, at Venice, they were unable to sleep, from the cries and shrieks of the starving crowds assembled under their windows and calling for bread." Of the moral and intellectual condition of Rome, however, Niebuhr never changed his strongly unfavourable opinion; and it may be safely doubted whether his characteristic impatience and the sombre tenor of his own thoughts do not somewhat colour the picture which he draws.

"Science," he says, "is utterly extinct here; of philologists there is none worthy of the name except the aged De Rossi, who is near his end. The impossibility of holding any affectionate or interesting intercourse with the natives of this country, is a great obstacle to progress in their language. Another hindrance is, that while all my anticipations regarding the miserable condition of Rome, in a moral point of view, have been fulfilled to the uttermost, I find the difference between the wretched language that is current, and the beautiful old language of the literature, far greater than I had even supposed it to be." "Rome," again, he says, "is a horrible place for any one who is melancholy, because it contains no living present to relieve the sense of sadness—the present is revolting, and in what exists there is not the slightest trace of antiquity to be recognised; there are not even any remains of the Church of the Middle Ages."

Amid so much disappointment with Rome itself, and its inhabitants, he found, however, satisfaction in his friendly reception at the Papal Court, and especially in the society of the German artists, Cornelius, Platner, Overbeck, and the two Schadows, then studying in Rome, and laying the foundation of the present German school of historical painting. With Bunsen also, whom he found in the Papal City, he enjoyed much congenial intercourse: a sympathy of feelings and pursuits soon united them in a very close and permanent friendship.

In April 1817 a son was born to Niebuhr; and already, with that strange enthusiastic hastiness of his, he is speculating about his education.

"The child is full of health; he looks briskly about him, and already begins to take notice. I can handle it very well; and it becomes quiet with me directly.

"I am thinking a great deal about his education. I told you a little while ago, how I intended to teach him the ancient languages very early by practice. I wish the child to believe all that is told him; and I now think you right in an assertion, which I have formerly disputed, that it is better to tell children no tales, but to keep to the poets. But while I shall repeat and read the old poets to him in such a way that he will undoubtingly take the gods and heroes for historical beings, I shall tell him at the same time, that the ancients had only an imperfect knowledge of the true God, and that these gods were overthrown when Christ came into the world. He shall believe in the letter of the Old and New Testaments, and I shall nurture in him from his infancy a firm faith in all that I have lost, or feel uncertain about. He shall learn to perceive and to observe, and thus grow familiar with nature, and nourish his imagination."—Vol. ii. pp. 101, 102.

The child was baptized by an English clergyman, according to the solemn ritual of the Established Church.

"I was deeply affected," he says, writing to Madame Hensler, "and repeated the vows for my child with my whole heart. Even the Catholics who were present could not help confessing the sublimity of this liturgy. The baptism was followed by a prayer for and with the mother, which is repeated kneeling. I held the child in your name." "He is coming on famously," he adds. "It often gives me a melancholy feeling when, in the evening, he stretches out his arms towards the light, and makes us carry him to the window, where he gazes up into the sky with a fixed bright serious look; often the recollection comes over me of how Milly, too, gazed up into the sky the last time we took her out. I thank Heaven that I can at least shed tears over this remembrance."—Vol. ii. p. 102.

Three daughters were subsequently born to Niebuhr in Rome. But his thoughts and affections continued to circle mainly round

his son. Many, and often very touching, are his allusions to him in his correspondence. "His nature is thoroughly good," he writes in 1820, "and his faculties become more and more harmonious as they develop themselves. He has a very quick understanding." And the following extract from a letter to Count Moltke, in 1823, shows how fondly he had watched over his education, and trained him according to the views which he so ardently cherished.

"My Marcus is a boy of excellent capacities; his education amidst antiquity has been perfectly successful. The old world is to him the true and real one; the modern only something accidental. This will undoubtedly render some bitter discoveries necessary in the future. Ancient history and mythology are as familiar to him as to a Roman boy eighteen hundred years ago; and he is burning with sympathy, and sheds tears for the heroes of the Trojan time, over the literal Latin translation of the Odyssey, which to us seems so miserable. He looks forward confidently to climbing Parnassus and seeing Jupiter and the old gods there, of whom I told him the modern Greek tradition that they have taken refuge in the summit of the mountain."—Vol. ii. p. 232.

Niebuhr's residence in Rome presents but few facts or features on which we care further to dwell. They do not serve to throw any additional light on his character or the progress of his mental culture. The chief point of interest, and the one which seems to have had the deepest influence on him, is the intimate and happy friendship which he formed with Count de Serre.

"He is one of the rarest and noblest human beings," he says, "that I have ever met with. We have expressed our sentiments to each other with perfect openness respecting all that deeply occupies the intellect of man; about the past and the future, about Germany and France. Nationality is no barrier between us: he is a perfect master of our language, though he prefers talking in French, because I speak it more easily than he does German. He is thoroughly acquainted with our literature; pronounces, for instance, exactly the same verdict as we do upon Goethe's writings at the different periods of his life. While an admirer of his youthful writings, 'Wilhelm Meister,' and others of a similar stamp, are distressing to him. He suits a court about as well as I do, except that, having better spirits he more easily adapts himself to every thing. Our political convictions are essentially quite identical."—Vol. ii. pp. 219, 220.

The instructions for the special mission on which Niebuhr had been sent to Rome were delayed from time to time, and only arrived four years after he had taken up his residence there. At length, however, the negotiations with the Papal government were brought to a satisfactory issue. On the completion of this business Niebuhr began to turn his thoughts homeward. The

miserable health of Madame Niebuhr was a strong inducement to this; and accordingly he sent a request that he might either be recalled or receive leave of absence. The latter was granted him, and in the summer of 1823 he left Rome, under the strong conviction that he should not revisit it. He returned to Germany leisurely, by way of Florence and St. Gall, at which latter place he spent a few weeks to recruit his health and examine the manuscripts in its celebrated library. At Heidelberg, where were two of his earliest friends, the aged Voss and Thibaut, he also made a brief stay. He then proceeded to Bonn, where he determined to take up his residence until it should be finally decided whether or not he returned to Rome.

Over the remainder of Niebuhr's life we can only linger for a moment. He returned in Bonn to his true vocation, that which, with a sure prescience which perhaps it had been well that he had sooner heeded, had floated before his early vision as the ideal of his life. Although not holding any official appointment in the university he again began the career of a public instructor. He delivered, from 1825 to 1830, a series of highly important lectures in connexion with the university, chiefly on Roman history, but also on the history of Greece, ancient history, and geography generally. He now adopted a different manner of delivery from that which characterized his earlier course in Berlin. Instead of the careful and detailed preparation which he had formerly practised, his only preparation now consisted in meditating for a short time on the subject of his lecture, and referring to authorities for his dates. He brought no written notes with him to the lecture-room. We are not surprised to learn that the result of this was a very varying success in imparting his ideas, depending on his physical and mental condition at the moment. Another still more serious consequence is, that we are indebted for all we learn of these later lectures to notes taken by students during their delivery.* While very unequal as a lecturer after this mode, we are assured that a rare and felicitous eloquence—the eloquence “of making the expression the exact reflection of the thought, of embodying each separate idea in an adequate but not redundant form,” not unfrequently characterized him. And this we can very well understand. Familiar as that ancient Life was to him of which he

* These lectures, in so far as they relate to the course of Roman history from the point where his published history stops, have, it is well known, been collected and translated by Dr. Schmitz. A translation of his lectures on Ancient History generally, some years ago collected and published in Germany, has also just appeared from the same indefatigable pen. As an interpreter of his great countryman, not only directly, but also indirectly, in his own admirable *Manual of Roman History*, the English public are deeply indebted to Dr. Schmitz.

discoursed, and vivid beyond all his powers of expression as were his glimpses of its true meaning, he must have often, in the enthusiasm of the moment, clothed his thoughts in pregnant and graphic forms,—transporting his hearers into the past, with some share of his own delight and rapture. We can also easily understand the affectionate interest which he excited among his pupils. His was exactly that combination of high capacity, simplicity of manner, and bright enthusiasm, so well calculated to win the hearts of students.

His historical labours, apart from his lectures, were chiefly devoted to the revision of the first and second volume of his history, and the preparation of the third volume, which, however, he was destined to leave unpublished. His great aim in the task of revision, to which he gave himself with the most sedulous care, was to express the exact degree of confidence with which he finally regarded his several assertions.

In May 1828, he paid his last visit to Holstein, and spent the summer in the house of Madame Hensler. His time was chiefly passed in happy social intercourse, and excursions into the beautiful scenery in the neighbourhood of Kiel. “On such occasions Niebuhr was always the centre of a group of children, who had soon discovered the willingness with which he entered into all their amusements, and his inability to refuse them any gratification.”

In 1830, his peace was again violently disturbed. First of all came the personal calamity of the burning down of his new house in the arrangement of which he had taken so much pleasure, and as Professor Brandis remarks, “before order and comfort could be created afresh from the ruins of his domestic existence, the news arrived of the second French Revolution.” The burning of his house in which so many valuable letters and papers were destroyed was naturally felt by him as a great misfortune. The loss, itself, however, was a small matter easily to be borne with; but his fears for its effects on the feeble health of Madame Niebuhr greatly harassed him, and left him, without doubt, more than usually susceptible to gloomy impressions. It was in this year that he received news of the three days of July,—news which would have powerfully affected him at any time, but which now seem to have embittered and saddened him in no ordinary degree. His intense interest in the course of events may be said to have been indirectly the cause of his death.

“He read the reports in the French journals with eager attention; and as these newspapers were much in request at that time, from the universal interest felt in their contents, he did not in general go to the public reading-room where he was accustomed to see the papers daily, until the evening. On Christ-

mas Eve and the following day, he was in better health and spirits than he had been for a long while, but on the evening of the 25th of December, he spent a considerable time waiting and reading in the hot news-room without taking off his thick fur cloak, and then returned home through the bitter frosty night air, heated in mind and body. Still full of the impressions made on him by the papers, he went straight to Classen's room, and exclaimed, 'that is true eloquence! You must read Sauzet's speech; he alone declares the true state of the case; that this is no question of law, but an open battle between hostile powers! Sauzet must be no common man! But,' he added immediately, 'I have taken a severe chill, I must go to bed.' And from the couch which he then sought, he never rose again, except for one hour, two days afterwards, when he was forced to return to it quickly, with warning symptoms of his approaching end.

"His illness lasted a week, and was pronounced on the fourth day to be a decided attack of inflammation on the lungs. His hopes sank at first, but rose with his increasing danger and weakness; even on the morning of the last day he said, 'I may still recover.' Two days before, his faithful wife who had exerted herself beyond her strength in nursing him, fell ill and was obliged to leave him. He then turned his face to the wall, and exclaimed, with the most painful presentiment, 'Hapless house! To lose father and mother at once!' And to the children he said, 'Pray to God, children, He alone can help us!' And his attendants saw that he himself was seeking comfort and strength in silent prayer. But when his hope of life revived, his active and powerful mind soon demanded its wonted occupation. The studies that had been dearest to him through life, remained so in death; his love for them was found to be pure and genuine by its unwavering perseverance to the last. While he was on his sick-bed, Classen read aloud to him for hours the Greek text of the Jewish History of Josephus, and he followed the sense with such ease and attention, that he suggested several emendations in the text at the moment; this may be called an unimportant circumstance, but it always appeared to us one of the most wonderful proofs of his mental powers. The last learned work in which he was able to testify his interest, was the description of Rome by Bunsen and his friends which had just been sent to him; the preface of the first volume was read aloud to him, and called forth expressions of pleasure and approbation. He also asked for light reading to pass the time, but our attempts to satisfy him were unsuccessful. A friend proposed '*Briefe eines Verstorbenen*,' which was making a great sensation; but he declined it, saying, that he feared that its levity would jar upon his feel-

ings. One of Cooper's novels was recommended to him, and excited his ridicule by its extraordinary verbiage. He was much amused by trying an experiment he proposed, which consisted in taking one period at hap-hazard on each page; and by the discovery that this mode of reading did little violence to the connexion of the story. The '*Cölnische Zeitung*' was read aloud to him up to the last day, with extracts from the French and other journals. He asked for them expressly only twelve hours before his death, and gave his opinion, half in jest, about the change of ministry in Paris. But on the afternoon of the 1st of January 1831, he sank into a dreamy slumber. Once, on awakening, he said that pleasant images floated before him in sleep; now and then he spoke French in his dreams; probably he felt himself in the presence of his departed friend De Serre. As the night gathered, consciousness gradually faded away; he woke up once more about midnight, when the last remedy was administered; he recognised in it a medicine of doubtful operation, never resorted to but in extreme cases, and said in a faint voice, 'What essential substance is this? Am I so far gone?' These were his last words; he sank back in his pillow, and within an hour his noble heart had ceased to beat."—Vol. ii. pp. 329-332.

If we now endeavour to gather up into a connected view our impressions of the character of Niebuhr, exhibited in these rapid traces of his life, it is certainly a noble and engaging picture that presents itself. A rare simplicity and conscientiousness, a tender and beautiful affectionateness, united with an exquisite polish and culture of understanding, are the characteristics that shine out upon us from the whole course of his career. There is above all a *thoroughness* about him, a genuine frankness and honesty which will brook no disguise. He scorned even with bitterness all approach to affectation of any kind, and his most earnest prayer for his boy was that he might never turn out "a conceited shallow fool, nor a man who is himself contented with superficiality, and assumes an appearance to throw dust in the eyes of others." Certainly no one could ever have cared less for mere appearances than Niebuhr. He was a true German in downright sincerity. His opinions were formed with independence, and held with outspoken earnestness. He was not content to think or speak on any subject at second hand; and he had no conception of cloaking or modifying his sentiments to suit the prejudices or ideas of others. He had, indeed, too little pliability. He was too little open to influences entitled to his consideration. His independence not unfrequently amounted to arrogance towards the views and feelings of others. His character was perhaps altogether too self-centred. This strong

egoism, founded as it was upon so rich and ample a scholarship, helped greatly to advance his historical investigations, although it also here led him sometimes into error. It must, we fancy, however, have but little qualified him for many of the subtle and accommodating duties of diplomacy; and, in fact, there is abundant evidence that the diplomatic yoke never sat easily on his impatient and independent spirit. He was not the stuff to make a courtier of in any sense. There is a story told by Bunsen (pp. 427-8,) which very well illustrates this, but which we cannot afford space to quote.

The thorough truthfulness characteristic of the man was even more conspicuously characteristic of the scholar and the writer. We know nothing, indeed, more noble and exalted than his example here—nothing more impressive than his statement of the principles which, in this respect, ought to animate the student, contained in his famous letter to “a young man who wished to devote himself to philology.” This is altogether a most precious letter,—the most perfect rubric of study we know anywhere to be found; we would have it engraven on the heart of every student. How full of truth and value, for instance, the following:—

“You do not write simply enough to express without pretension a thought that is dear to your mind. That you cannot give richness and soundness to your style is no subject for blame; for though there have been some, especially in former times, who by the particularly fortunate guidance given to a peculiar talent, have been able to do this at your age, such perfection is, as a rule, out of the question. Fullness and maturity of expression presuppose a maturity of soul which can only arrive in the progress of its development. But what we always can and always ought to do, is not to strive after the semblance of more than we can perform, and to think, and express ourselves with straightforwardness and correctness.”—Vol. ii. pp. 225-6.

And again,

“All writing should be nothing but the symbol of the thought and speech.” . . . “Everything must be based upon thought, and the thought must shape the structure of the language.” . . . “If our thoughts do not satisfy us, if we turn and twist in the consciousness of our poverty, writing will become a horrible labour to us.”—P. 229.

But it is with the earnest manner in which he inculcates truthfulness that we are at present concerned.

“But above all things,” he says, “we must preserve our truthfulness in science so pure, that we must eschew absolutely every false appearance—that we must not write the very smallest thing as certain of which we are not fully convinced—that when we have to affirm a conjecture, we must attenuously endeavour to exhibit the precise degree of probability we attach to it. If we do not ourselves indicate

our own errors, where possible, even such as it is unlikely that any one will ever discover—if when we lay down our pen we cannot say in the sight of God, upon strict examination, I have not knowingly written anything that is not true, and have never deceived, either regarding myself, or others; I have not exhibited my most inveterate opponent in any light which I could not justify upon my death-bed; if we cannot do this, then study and literature render us unrighteous and sinful.”—Pp. 230, 231.

Then, after alluding to his own practice of never quoting at second hand, and remarking that he would not blame others who are less strict in this respect, supposing that they either mention that their citations are borrowed, or that it is really a matter of indifference to them whether or not people consider them to be more profoundly learned than they truly are, he proceeds to say,—

“But of a young man I require absolutely, and without indulgence, were it only as an exercise of virtue, the most scrupulous truthfulness in literary as in all other matters, that it may become a part of his very nature, or rather that the truthfulness which God has implanted in his nature may remain there. With this weapon alone can we fight our way through the world. The hour in which my Marcus should tell an untruth, or give himself the semblance of a merit that he did not possess, would make me very unhappy; it would be the fall in Paradise.”—P. 232.

Even by those who may consider Niebuhr somewhat rigid in his exactions here, it will not be disputed that there is almost a sublimity about the truthfulness of the man who could thus write. He could not brook that the shadow of a falsehood should rest on any work of his. There was no charm or grace—no drapery of external decoration that could compensate, in his eyes, for the unveiled aspect of truth. Loving poetry from his heart, and possessing a warm and lively sympathy with its beautiful fictions in every age, he yet loved truth better. The pale sparkle of this lustrous gem delighted him more than the brilliancy of the finest invention. And this is the key to all his labours on Roman History. It was not in the least degree a merely destructive zeal that led him to tear off the poetic vesture in which that history had become hidden. It was not because the imaginative picture of Rome's early career had no attractions for him. On the contrary, on every page of his history there is the evidence how deeply it interested him—with what a thorough and genial love he dwelt on it. But it was because he longed to penetrate to the traces of fact that lay concealed beneath the embellishments of the picture. The mere work of sceptical demolition was not in any sense peculiarly his. It did not remain for him to doubt for the first time the historical veracity of the

common narrative transmitted by Livy. But his was eminently the merit of discerning the *true* beneath all the distortions of poetic colouring. The ruins were not made by him; they lay already scattered around. But his it was, for the first time, to seize, in some degree, the outline and form of the ruined and obliterated structure.

While marking a stern truthfulness as among the most prominent characteristics of Niebuhr, it would indeed be a strangely erroneous conclusion to judge him deficient in the warmth and sensibility of genius. His letters everywhere shew him, on the contrary, to be the child of feeling and enthusiasm. The deep tenderness of his nature breaks out in all relations. All the aspects of life especially—all that is lovely, or grand, or touching in human passion or affection, had a living interest for him, and swayed him with a living power. His heart moved in tremulous response to all that is ennobling and beautiful in human character or conduct. His historical intuition was eminently vivid and *poetic*. It was as an animate and shaping picture, in which the forms of ancient Life presented themselves in clear and distinct colouring, that the Past stood before him. And as to his labours on the early Roman History, even in their most negative aspect, what were they but just the analysis and reproduction, in its genuine form, of the poetic element which had become so largely involved in it? Far from discovering any lack of poetic appreciation, it was the very depth and delicacy of this power in him which enabled him to reclaim for Poetry those fine old stories which not even the most tedious and insipid narratives of ancient and modern compilers had succeeded in utterly mutilating and destroying.

There is one point, but indistinctly intimated in our previous detail of Niebuhr's life, which might have claimed from us a somewhat minute and patient consideration—we mean his religious convictions.* We had intended to dwell perhaps at some length on this point; but we prefer, upon reflection, to allow him to speak for himself, with but slight comment on our part. The subject is one not to be hastily dealt with, and our space is rapidly drawing to a close.

Niebuhr, as we have already hinted, had but little sympathy with those vague and abstruse speculations so congenial to his countrymen. He seems never for a moment to have lost himself in the region of Transcendental Philosophy. His deep love of reality, and warm sympathy with all the practical interests of human life, saved him from this. He had grown up, however, amid the theological "enlightenment" of the old Rationalism, and although, as he afterwards says, contemplating it with disgust, he yet could not fail to own its influence in some degree. If in no other respect, he felt its effects in the want of any adequate

religious instruction in his youth. It is not much to be wondered at, therefore, if his riper views should bear the trace of this—if a vague uncertainty should still have haunted as its shadow the faith to which his heart clung. His early historical studies, too, did not certainly tend to check the sceptical influences under which he had been educated—but rather the reverse. The following extract from the deeply interesting letter addressed to an anonymous correspondent, may serve to place the measure of his scepticism, and the causes which operated in its production, before the reader :—

“ Faith, properly so called, in a much wider sense than religious faith, it is either not given to every nature to possess, or the possibility of its taking root and flourishing may be annihilated by an inharmonious intellectual life. The soil may be fertile, but the climate ungenial. My intellect early took a sceptical direction. With my whole attention bent upon the real and the historical, eager to comprehend and to get to the bottom of everything, I let my thoughts follow the natural association of ideas, without endeavouring to guide them into any particular channel; and in this respect had neither, properly speaking, a truly creative imagination, nor any strong feeling of the need of something beyond the boundaries of experience to satisfy my heart; or perhaps I let both perish for want of nourishment. Altogether, it was very seldom that the consciousness of a thought vanished from my mind in the contemplation of its import and object. To this, unquestionably my natural turn of mind, was added the influence of miserable religious instruction, and of the living study of classical antiquity. Thus, it was in riper years, and through the study of history, that I came back for the first time to the sacred books, which I read in a purely critical spirit, and with the purpose of studying their contents as the groundwork of one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of the world. This was not a mood in which real faith could spring up, for it was that of the Protestantism of the present day. I needed no Wolfenbüttel fragments to discover the discrepancies of the Gospels, and the impossibility of even drawing the outlines of a tenable history of the life of Jesus by such criticism. In the Messianic allusions to the Old Testament, I could recognise no prophecies, and could explain all the passages adduced with perfect ease. But here, as in every historical subject, when I contemplated the immeasurable gulf between the narrative and the facts narrated, this disturbed me no further. He, whose earthly life and sorrows were depicted, had for me a perfectly real existence, and his whole history had the same reality, even if it were not related with literal exactness in any single point. Hence also the fundamental fact of miracles which, according to my conviction, must be conceded, unless we adopt the not merely incomprehensible but absurd hypothesis, that the Holiest was a deceiver, and his disciples either dupes or liars; and that deceivers had preached a holy religion, in which self-renunciation is everything, and in which there is nothing tending towards the erection of a priestly rule—

nothing that can be acceptable to vicious inclinations. As regards a miracle in the strictest sense, it really only requires an unprejudiced and penetrating study of nature, to see that those related are as far as possible from absurdity, and a comparison with legends, or the pretended miracles of other religions, to perceive by what a different spirit they are animated."—Vol. i. pp. 339, 340.

It will be seen even from this, ample as the confession of unbelief may appear to many, how far Niebuhr was from the desolating naturalism that at this time still held so many minds in Germany. If the purity and simplicity of his faith were marred—if his intellect and his heart were unreconciled on the ground of Scripture—he yet obviously possessed a clear recognition of the divine mission of the Saviour and of the divine power of that faith which he taught. The story of the Life of Jesus seemed to him indeed fragmentary and incomplete; but the Life itself was a reality. The picture was broken and defaced, but there were traces enough of divine harmony and beauty in it. And the Christian convictions of Niebuhr seem to have gathered strength and clearness, as his mind continued to dwell on the facts of the Christian history. Writing from Rome in 1818, two years later than the letter from which we have just quoted, he expresses himself with confidence and earnestness concerning the reality of historical Christianity. The revered Neander was deeply touched with his "golden words," and hailed them as a signal testimony to the truth "from one of the greatest men of modern times." "In my opinion," he says, "he is not a Protestant Christian who does not receive the historical facts of Christ's earthly life in their literal acceptance, with all its miracles, as equally authentic with any event recorded in history, and whose belief in them is not as firm and tranquil as his belief in the latter; who has not the most absolute faith in the articles of the Apostle's creed, taken in their grammatical sense; who does not consider every doctrine and every precept of the New Testament as undoubted divine revelation in the sense of the Christians of the first century, who knew nothing of a theopneustia. Moreover, a Christianity after the fashion of the modern philosophers and Pantheists, without a personal God, without immortality, without human individuality, without historical faith, is no Christianity at all to me; though it may be a very intellectual, very ingenious philosophy. I have often said that I do not know what to do with a metaphysical God, and that I will have none but the God of the Bible, who is heart to heart with us."

We will only say further on this matter, that whatever may have been defective in Niebuhr's theoretical views of Christianity, his life shews not feebly the beautiful traces of Christian virtue. In the numerous and varied letters of these volumes, the man

stands before us in the full breadth and depth of his inner being; and it would not be easy to match the moral purity and integrity of the picture presented to us. It is no mere hard and featureless stoicism we contemplate, no mere Pagan rectitude; but the lines of the portrait are stamped with the deep and pervasive energy of Righteousness, and softened and graced by the gentle touch of Charity. If his intellect may have halted in the acknowledgment of the whole truth, there is evidence that his heart and temper had bowed to that divine might which can alone remould in "the beauty of holiness" the degraded vessel of our fallen humanity. From the depths of his soul, we believe, did he feel the import and the value of the prayer to which he gives utterance in the same letter written from Rome. "O that men strove in simplicity of heart, and in union with those like-minded to themselves, to attain true fruit-bearing faith, piety, and love."

If we now venture to express, in conclusion, our brief estimate of Niebuhr's position and work as an Historian, it is with no pretensions to decide with any authority on either. We are too conscious of the difficulty of the task. Only in a review of his life, some remarks on its chief labour would seem to be necessary.

We have already sufficiently indicated our conception of Niebuhr's historical work as in the highest degree constructive, and not in any sense merely of a negative and sceptical character. He did indeed overthrow, but it was ever only with the view of reaching to the basis of truth beneath. He had no love for the process of destruction in itself. If necessarily so much engaged in clearing away, it was only that he might penetrate to the actual shape of the fabric, concealed and encumbered by the parasitic growth of centuries. The task to which Niebuhr set himself, was beyond all question the positive one of reconstructing the *history* of Rome from the legendary narrative with which it had become so mixed up and identified. This was his aim, whatever may be thought of his success.

And to this great work it cannot be doubted he brought consummate powers. It was not merely the vastness of his learning: it was above all, the depth and range of his historical vision. His implements of investigation were not merely of the highest power and the keenest edge, but he had that gift of *sight* into antiquity, which no mere amount of learned accoutrements can ever impart. He had the eye to see and understand the Past as no one before him had done. And this natural power of insight he had trained with the most assiduous culture. For years his gaze had dwelt with "ever renewed, undeviating steadfastness" on the confused and blended picture, till, as he himself finely says, he had seen "the history of mistaken,

misrepresented, and forgotten events, rise out of mists and darkness, and assume substance and shape, as the scarcely visible aerial form of the nymph in the Slavonian tale, takes the body of an earthly maiden beneath the yearning gaze of love."* It was this genuine love of the old classical Life not only in its outward and more accidental aspects, its circumstantial history—which was all really that had as yet engaged the attention of the modern historian; but in its inward organic development, its essentially characteristic features, which especially distinguished Niebuhr. He comprehended for the first time adequately the varied interest and import of that Life—its full depth and consistency; and sought to develop and explain the different forms in which it expressed itself. Many had before brought ample learning and ability to the task of writing ancient history, but none had as yet entered as he did into the Life of the ancient people, or endeavoured to trace as he did, the rise and development of those institutions in which it was at once exhibited and restrained. No one had as yet aimed to reproduce the Past in its deeper national significance—in all the variety of its social and political phases; and no higher praise can well be bestowed upon Niebuhr, than that he was the first clearly to grasp this conception of history, however imperfectly he may have realized it.

Of his realization of the work which he had so well conceived, there cannot well, we think, be any difference of opinion. It is undoubtedly in a great degree imperfect. With so rich and vivid an historical intuition, he was yet greatly deficient in the artistic skill of representation. He could *see* for himself, but he had not the craft to work out his vision in an efficient and interesting form for others. There is not a reader we are sure out of a hundred, who does not find with all his best endeavours, that it is a hard task to read Niebuhr's history. He has so accumulated on his pages the materials of his investigations—he at once buries the reader with himself in such a mass of circumstantialities, that it requires a vision similar to his own—a similar familiarity with antiquity—to thread one's way among them, and catch the line of his exposition or narrative. In so far there can be no doubt that Niebuhr mistook the function of the Historian. All throughout his work, including his third volume, for which Arnold claimed more of the character of genuine history, it is rather as the dissertator upon history, than the actual Historian, that he appears. And we have seen that he himself was not insensible to this predominantly expository and critical character of his labours. His style, too, is, as a

* History, vol. ii. p. 14.

whole, laboriously Teutonic in its structure, abounding often to very weariness with exceptive clauses, although often, also, it must be admitted, rich and solid in the compass and vigour of its expressions. He sets at times, by a few ripe and felicitous touches, a full and rich picture before the reader; but his general narrative is wholly wanting in pictorial skill and animation. It is always the heavy and didactic march of the essayist, rather than the rapid and flexible movement of the narrator. Much of all this was, no doubt, owing to the nature of the subject, where he had not only to describe the course of facts according to his own conception, but ever to clear away before him the misrepresentations with which it had been encumbered. But then it is just because this process of clearance is constantly so obvious on his pages,—because he gives us not only the results, but also the details of his investigations, and often in so minute and crowded a manner, that we must pronounce Niebuhr deficient in historical art, and that his great work must be regarded more as a rich quarry from which others may build the finished structure, than in any sense such a structure itself.

Niebuhr's great merit, however, remains as in some sense the author of that new conception of history which regards the whole Life of a people in its social and constitutional development. This conception was no doubt one rising upon the age, and making itself therefore more or less consciously intelligible to many minds; but there were none who as yet had so clearly grasped and applied it as Niebuhr did in relation to the Roman people. That he was not able to realize with artistic effect his own conception, is perhaps not to be wondered at. It is not always given to the same minds at once to divine and to execute. Others rise to carry out in the most successful practical form, the teeming idea which its own author so vividly felt, but did not adequately realize. But the man to whom it is given first clearly to express or render intelligible such an *Idea*, is a master man in his time, and even by those who may least acknowledge his teaching, his influence must be felt through many generations. It is in this way, we believe, that the greatness of Niebuhr's historical labours is most attested. It is not the actual amount of historical truth that they have added to our knowledge, but it is the impulse they communicated to historical criticism, on a penetrative and comprehensive principle hitherto unknown, which makes them mark an era. The special worth of many of his conclusions in Roman history may be disputed, but the searching character of his historical method, and the deeper and more exhaustive range he vindicated for historical inquiry, will bear fruit, as it has already amply done, in the more picturesque and life-like pages of many future historians.

- ART. VI.—1. *The Archæology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland.* By DANIEL WILSON, Honorary Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1851.*
2. *The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark.* By J. J. A. WORSAAE, &c., &c. Translated and applied to the illustration of similar Remains in England, by W. T. Thoms, F.S.A. Oxford, 1849.
3. *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd.* By the Rev. W. B. JONES, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. London, 1851.
4. *Remains of Pagan Saxondom, principally from Tumuli in England.* By JOHN YONGE AKERMAN, Fellow and Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Part I.

THE study of antiquities has frequently, and in many cases by no means unjustly, served as a laughing-stock to not a few who would willingly acknowledge that, when treated as it is in the works whose titles we have just transcribed, it can afford no just matter for ridicule, except to those by whom any pursuit not directly subservient to present wealth and comfort is at once dismissed with scorn. It is indeed but very recently that antiquarian research has assumed a character which could fairly put it out of the reach of well-merited contempt. Just now, indeed, the present race of archæologists possibly treat their predecessors with too little reverence; certain it is that, to a genuine disciple of the new school, few sorts of reading afford such unalloyed amusement as the great bulk of works bequeathed to him by his precursors even of the last generation. From dull plodding on the one hand, and wild speculation on the other, Archæology has assumed the character of a science; results are combined, and inferences deduced, according to the rules of logic and the laws of evidence; and the new science holds out her hand to those which have been recognised before her, though we hear some not unreasonable complaints that she has been sometimes a little scurvily treated by her elder sisters.

Such at least is the opinion of the learned author of the first work on our list, which, as having more direct claims upon a *North British Review*, we mean more fully to review in a stricter sense, employing the others chiefly in drawing out a connected statement of the most important results of primeval archæological study up to the present time. The reputation of Mr. Worsaae's work is already made, and it has taken its place as a text-book on the subject. Mr. Jones' treatise has a more

* Since this work was published the author has worthily received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of St. Andrews.

limited sphere, and is perhaps hardly archæological in the very strictest sense; his inquiry is immediately confined to the population of a small corner of our island, but his view, if found correct, is in close connexion with a most important fact in the general ethnology of the three kingdoms.

Of Dr. Wilson's volume, which we owe an apology to our readers for not noticing sooner, our opinion in brief would be, that he has shown himself thoroughly master of his subject, but that he has hardly shown himself equally master of the art of writing a book about it. No one can study his work without recognising the results of most unwearied research, combined with a good acquaintance with the general laws of historical evidence, and skill in applying some of the principles of inductive argument to the materials before him. A remarkably strong vein of common sense runs through the whole composition. His style of writing is, with a few exceptions, pure and unaffected, and an occasional stroke of sly satire is, for the most part, very skilfully managed. On the whole, the work is a very valuable contribution to English literature in the department to which it relates.

One great object of Dr. Wilson's book is to connect simple archæology, meaning hereby the study of man's artificial works, from bone fish-hooks to Gothic cathedrals, with what are really its kindred studies; with geology on the one hand, with social and political history on the other. The connexion of archæology and geology he has treated in an exceedingly able manner; we have seldom read anything more striking than the chapters in which he depicts the intrusion of the earliest Allophylian race upon the domain of wild beasts, some species of which now exist only in a fossil state. With the other side of his task Dr. Wilson is, we think, less successful. It has struck us more than once, that he fails in that broad grasp of general history which is so desirable in a work of this kind, and that he has no very deep acquaintance with classical antiquity. When he gets on this last field he sometimes commits mistakes, and never seems quite at home.*

* Thus in quoting Festus Avienus (p. 195,) he misdates that author eight centuries, placing him B.C. 400, instead of A.D. In p. 198 we are told that the *Phœsicians* colonized Marzeilles, which we may charitably conclude is a misprint for Phœœans. In p. 547—to turn to a piece of Teutonic antiquity—we find the famous ode on Athelstan's victory so translated as to represent the "grey deer" as among the animals to whom the carcasses of Scot and Northman were assigned as a prey. Here the philological difficulty vanishes before the zoological: has Dr. Wilson any ground for believing that so important a change in the diet of the Ruminantia has taken place within so comparatively recent a period? Hardly less difficulty should we have in believing that "some small flint-flakes and arrow-heads, gathered on the elevated mound of the tomb of the Plateans at Marathon," were "weapons used by the Greek patriots in repelling the Persian invader."

We cannot extend our commendation so unreservedly to the arrangement of the work as to the matter. There is a lack of real systematic method; information is frequently found in an earlier or later stage of the book than the table of contents would have led us to expect.* Again, while one chief object of the book is to connect archæology with ethnology, and while no one is more skilful in applying archæological facts to prove ethnological conclusions, the author nowhere gives his ethnological system in a connected form, but leaves his readers to patch it up how they may, from various statements and allusions scattered up and down the volume.

Moreover, he does not seem to have thoroughly grasped the wide distinction between a paper in publications like the *Archæological Journal*, and a formal and standard treatise on a general subject of archæology. The former is of course a mere occasional composition, descriptive of some individual object or class of objects, mere "*mémoires pour servir*," in which the minuter the description of every object, and everything relating to it, the better. But in a volume like Dr. Wilson's we want results, we want some general view, to which the individual examples should serve merely as illustrations. This Mr. Worsaae has seen and acted upon with his usual clearness and method. But Dr. Wilson gives us long stories about individual swords, tombs, or bracelets, and often leaves us to find out the general view to which they subserve from mere scattered allusions. Nothing is more perplexing to a reader than this confusion of the theorem and the demonstration; but though Dr. Wilson carries it to a greater length than any writer whom we have come across for some time, we must confess that he sins in good company; it is *the* fault of the immortal work of Niebuhr.*

Now every one who has read either *Æschylus* or *Byron*, to say nothing of *Herodotus* or *Thirlwall*, is pretty well acquainted with the fact that the bow was the Persian, the spear the Grecian weapon, and, as *Herodotus* distinctly mentions (iii. 69) tribes with arrow and javelin heads of stone and bone among the followers of *Xerxes*, we may easily conceive warriors with similar equipments to have swelled those of *Datis* and *Artaphernes*. With one or two exceptions, Dr. Wilson's mistakes, arising from this source, do not bear upon the immediate subject of *Scottish Archæology*, and, consequently, do not greatly detract from the direct value and authority of his book, but they are blemishes in a work of this character which we should be glad to see corrected in the next edition. One, and that among the most singular of all, does seem to affect his main argument. A good deal of his reasoning as to the comparative antiquity of the use of different metals in different parts of Europe, turns upon the dates of the earliest barbaric irruptions into the Roman territory. Now, after diligently examining Dr. Wilson's statements (in p. 351,) we cannot avoid the conclusion, that he believes that the capture of *Rome* by *Brennus* took place "circa a.c. 113-100," so that *Camillus* and *Marius* encountered, we must suppose, different divisions of the same army.

* Dr. Wilson sometimes uses terms in a loose way, so that it is not easy to reach his real meaning. This is peculiarly the case with the compound terms of *Ethno-*

But we will pass from the unpleasant task of fault-finding, which we have performed from a sense of the great importance of the book, and a desire that it should be as nearly as possible free from defects which might diminish its value as a standard work in this department of literature. We should like to see Dr. Wilson recast his work in a more portable form, correct his occasional positive mistakes, and introduce more order and system. As a contribution to the latter object, we will now endeavour to put together the results of our study of the works at the head of this article, in the course of which we hope to shew, that although we have noted some points in Dr. Wilson's volume which require amendment, it contains very much which we deeply appreciate and admire.

By Primeval Archæology, in its more extended sense, we understand a science which endeavours, from internal evidence, to throw light on the condition of a country and its inhabitants in periods anterior to history. It seeks, from an investigation of whatever traces they have left behind them, to ascertain who were the inhabitants, and what was their amount of civilisation, in ages when no written records existed. From an examination of their weapons, their utensils, their sepulchres, and, above all, their skulls, it would reconstruct a picture of a state of things on which written history, and even tradition itself, is silent. Such a process of course cannot recover the names and actions of individuals, or, in many cases, even of nations, nor can it fix any other than an approximate and comparative date to the events which it rescues from oblivion, yet it can often establish the chronological succession, though not the duration, of various races in the same country, and can throw much light upon their social condition, their habits, and even their religious belief. Such a work requires no small powers and no small judgment; it can only be carried on by a sound process of induction from phenomena, equally opposed to the mere lifeless accumulation of facts, and to that spirit of insane speculation which has built up so many beautiful theories, which unfortunately have often not a solitary fact to stand upon. This line of investigation is that which is followed by all our authors; and we think that an attentive study of their works might have caused a recent historian, equally admirable in his own depart-

logy. His application to one of the three primeval periods of the Scandinavian antiquaries, of the *allas* "Teutonic or Iron," involves an ethnological position which he neither proves nor distinctly states. In this respect Dr. Wilson contrasts unfavourably with Mr. Worsaae, who is the very personification of clearness and method. His arguments may not invariably bring conviction, but there can never be any doubt as to what his opinions really are.

ment, to have abstained from a somewhat flippant and uncalled for denunciation of pre-historic studies altogether.*

To accomplish this end it is necessary to inquire into a great many objects whose first aspect is far from interesting, and which only derive any charm or value from their connexion with other and higher pursuits. Certainly a mind which can delight in the investigation of old heaps of stones, broken pots, and flakes of flint, simply for their own sake, must be very curiously constituted, and to such an one the jests so commonly levelled at antiquarian researches would apply in their fulness. In other branches of archæology, those, for instance, which are concerned with really beautiful examples of the fine arts, there is a value in the objects themselves, irrespective of their proving anything. A statue or a picture, a castle or a cathedral, has a charm in itself, without at all bringing in its further undoubted value as throwing light upon the history and manners of the age which produced it. The principles of the arts themselves are a distinct branch of philosophy, as worthy of cultivation as any other. But the celt and the palstave, even the gold armilla and the leaf-shaped bronze sword, have no such value as this; they are simply valuable as instrumental to a higher knowledge—as opening to us the wonderful stores of unrecorded history, and thereby contributing, in no small degree, to our general knowledge of man and his nature. Turn casually over an occasional paper on these subjects, and nothing seems more uninviting than the record of each particular discovery; even look at the objects themselves in an antiquarian collection, and the eye involuntarily turns away from the rough stone or the rusty iron, to the gorgeous works of a later period, to the brilliant enamel, the gold-tipped drinking-horn, or the jewelled chalice; but take the whole series of discoveries in their proper order and connexion, and they assume an interest absolutely fascinating. There is a peculiar charm, which the records of no historical period can supply, in thus groping through the darkness of the world's first ages, and exploring what was as mysterious to the earliest extant writers as it is in our own day. These relics, on which we hardly deign to cast a glance as we hurry on to more attractive objects, prove to be the most valuable of all lessons in the early history of mankind. They open to us the infancy of the world; we see the aboriginal settler, not only without the arts of civilized life, without letters and their results, but without metals, without agriculture, trusting himself to the waves in a fire-hollowed canoe, which he has wrought out of the primeval oaks of the forest, and waging war with no better weapons than bone

* Palgrave's *History of England and Normandy*, p. 468.

and flint against denizens of the wilderness which have been removed from the register of existing beings. If these considerations raise some questions which it would be difficult to answer respecting the early condition of man,—whether, for instance, this rude mode of life was man's original state, or whether those who were condemned to it had lost the knowledge of arts with which their forefathers had been acquainted; still, when we consider in how many remote countries the same phenomena are discovered, and how closely analogous is the course of improvement in nearly every case, they surely supply an additional argument in support of that revealed truth which every new scientific discovery seems the more strongly to confirm,—the essential unity of the human race.

The primeval period of Archæology in any given country begins from an epoch of indefinite antiquity, and is terminated by whatever event brings it within the pale of written history;—events such as the Roman Conquest of Gaul or Britain, or the introduction of Christianity into countries beyond the limits of the empire. In England the heathen age of Anglo-Saxon occupation may perhaps be considered as a sort of return to the primeval period.* It may perhaps be most convenient not to draw the line very accurately at any particular date, but to use the word to designate, in the northern and western parts of Europe, all examples of native workmanship earlier than what would be recognised as mediæval.

This long range of time may in most countries be divided into the periods of *Stone*, *Bronze*, and *Iron*; so called from the material of which the most important weapons and utensils were made in each of them. They express three steps in a gradual march towards civilisation; the use of bronze being an advance over the entire ignorance of metals during the stone period, and that of iron, the most serviceable metal, being a further advance over that of bronze. Of the ornamental metals, gold seems to have been generally the first known, and accompanies the use of bronze articles; while silver, for the most part, does not appear till the age of iron.

Relics of the stone period are found 'over a very large portion of the earth.' We find in the passage above referred to from Herodotus, that some of the "Æthiopians" had not got beyond it in the fifth century, B. C., and many barbarous and distant tribes remain in the same state till this day. "Implements of stone," says Mr. Worsae, (p. 128,) which are exactly similar, occur in Japan, in America, in the South Sea Islands, and

* The antiquities of this period bid fair to be well illustrated in Mr. Akerman's "Remains of Pagan Saxondom,"—we do not much admire the name—of which we have received the first part since this article was written.

elsewhere." They belong to a particular stage of human development or retrogression, and not to any particular race.

"The substitution," says Dr. Wilson, "of flint, stone, horn, and wood, in the absence of metal weapons and implements, must be abundantly familiar to all, in the customs of society when met with in a rude and primitive condition. The Fins and Esquimaux, the African Bushmen, and the natives of such of the Polynesian Islands as are rarely visited by Europeans, still construct knives and arrow-heads of flint or fish-bone, and supply themselves with wooden clubs and stone adzes and hammers, with little consciousness of imperfection or deficiency in such appliances. Examples of such a state of arts and human skill might be multiplied from the most dissimilar sources. It seems, as has been already remarked, to be a stage through which all nations have passed, not without each developing a sufficient individuality to render their arts well worthy of investigation by their descendants. To this primitive era of history we refer under the name of the Stone Period."—P. 29.

It would seem to be a necessary consequence that the commencement of this state of things in any country coincides with the first appearance of human inhabitants in that country; that the stone period, wherever it occurs, must be the earliest of all; and the men of that period as strictly aborigines as any men are. Now, it is difficult to conceive how the knowledge of metals, which certainly existed in antediluvian times, could ever have been lost; but it is surely easier to imagine that it might be lost during long-continued wanderings than that such an all-important knowledge should have slipped out of the hands of its possessors after they had made the remotest approach to settled habitations in any country. We may therefore conclude that the earliest men of the Stone Period were the earliest inhabitants of Britain or of any other country where their relics exist; for people in such a condition cannot be conceived to have entered it as conquerors of a people more advanced; the only conceivable case would be the exceptional one of their occupying a territory *deserted* by a more civilized race.

When these first inhabitants, then, reached Britain it is of course impossible to prove chronologically, but it could not have been at a very early stage of the great dispersion of the human race. An island at the extreme west of Europe might probably remain uninhabited long after countries nearer the general Asiatic centre had received a settled population and a social polity.

"Britain," observes Dr. Latham,* "is an island. Everything relating to the natural history of the useful arts is so wholly uninvestigated, that no one has proposed even to approximate the date of the first launch of the first boat; in other words, of the first occupation of

* Man and his Migrations, p. 153. See also p. 66 of the same Work.

a piece of land surrounded by water. The whole of that particular continent in which the first protoplasts saw light may have remained full to overflowing before a single frail raft had effected the first human migration. Britain may have remained a solitude for centuries and millenniums after Gaul had been full."

But, on the other hand, we have certain geological phenomena coming in to prove the immense positive antiquity of the date at which the first human occupation of Britain took place. The manner in which this subject is treated by Dr. Wilson forms, in our opinion, by far the most valuable and interesting portion of his work.

"We learn from an examination of the detritus and its included fossils, that at the period immediately preceding the occupation of the British Islands by their first colonists, the country must have been almost entirely covered with forests and overrun by numerous races of animals long since extinct. . . . The most extensive discoveries of mammalian remains and recent skulls generally occur along the valleys by which the present drainage of the country takes place, and hence we infer that little change has taken place in its physical conformation since their deposition. . . . They belong to that period in which our planet was passing through its very latest stage of preparation prior to its occupation by man; a period on which the geologist, who deals with phenomena of the most gigantic character, and with epochs of vast duration, is apt to dwell with diminished interest, but which excites in the thoughtful mind a keener sympathy than all that preceded it. The general geographical disposition of the globe was then nearly as it still remains. Our own island was, during a great portion of it, insulated, as it is now. Yet it is of this familiar locality that the palæontologist remarks:— 'In this island, anterior to the deposition of the drift, there was associated with the great extinct tiger, bear, and hyæna of the caves, in the destructive task of controlling the numbers of the richly developed order of the herbivorous mammalia, a feline animal, (the *Machairodus Latidens*,) as large as the tiger, and to judge by its instruments of destruction, of greater ferocity.' It was within the epoch to which these strange mammals belong, and while some of them, and many other contemporaneous forms of being still animated the scene, that man was introduced upon this stage of existence, and received dominion over every living thing."—P. 22.

Dr. Wilson then quotes several instances in which the remains of extinct animals have been found with the marks of wounds evidently inflicted by human agency, and by the instrumentality of the rude weapons of the period we are now examining. He then proceeds with the following animated picture of primeval Britain and its inhabitants:—

"Thus much is apparent from the most superficial glance at the geological evidence of the primeval state of Britain within the historic era,—that though corresponding in its great geographical out-

lines to its present condition, it differed, in nearly every other respect, as widely as it is possible for us to conceive of a country capable of human occupation. A continuous range of enormous forests covered nearly the whole face of the country. Vast herds of wild cattle, of gigantic proportions and fierce aspect, roamed through the chase, while its thickets and caves were occupied by carnivora, preying on the herbivorous animals, and little likely to hold in dread the armed savage who intruded on their lair. The whole of these have existed since the formation of the peat began, and therefore furnish some evidence of the very remote antiquity to which we must refer the origin of some of the wastes that supply, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, an important element in the elucidation of primitive chronology. Upon this singular arena *Archæology* informs us that the primeval Briton entered, unprovided with any of those appliances with which the arts of civilisation arm man against such obstacles. Intellectually, he appears to have been in nearly the lowest stage to which an intelligent being can sink; morally, he was the slave of a superstition, the grovelling character of which will be traced in reviewing his sepulchral rites; physically, he differed little in stature from the modern inheritors of the same soil, but his cerebral development was poor, his head small in proportion to his body, his hands, and probably his feet, also small; while the weapons with which he provided himself for the chase, and the few implements that ministered to his limited necessities, indicate only the crude development of that inventive ingenuity which first distinguishes the reason of man from the instincts of the brutes."—P. 27.

"The fossil cetacea especially," observes our author, "furnish most interesting and conclusive evidence of the very remote period at which the presence of a human population is discoverable in Scotland." He instances several cases in which fossil whales have been discovered in situations now considerably removed from the sea, and where the rude harpoon of deer's horn lay by the side of the animal. Boats of very primitive construction have also been dug up, imbedded deep in various positions now quite out of the reach of water.

"Some of these historic phenomena which are indicated above, required only time to produce them. The beds of sand and loam at Springfield, in which the ancient fleets of the Clyde have lain entombed for ages, are such as the slow depositions of winter floods will, for the most part, account for; if the chronologist can only spare for them the requisite centuries. Others seem to point to geological changes within the historic era of a more remarkable and extensive character. These it is not our province to explain. Whether the geologist find it most consistent with the established laws of his science to assume the standing of the whole ocean at higher levels within so recent a period, or adopt the more probable theory of local upheaval and denudation, to account for these phenomena, this, at least, must be conceded, that the lapse of many ages is required for the changes which they indicate, and we can hardly err in inferring that civilisa-

tion had advanced but a little way on the plain of Nimroud, or the banks of the Nile, when the tiny fleets of the Clyde were navigating its estuary, and the hardy fishermen were following the whale in the winding creeks of the Forth."—P. 40.

Dr. Wilson has opened a curious field of inquiry in his chapter on "the Dwellings of the Stone Period." The most interesting specimens of this primitive architecture are the subterranean vaults, locally known as *weem's**, some of which seem satisfactorily determined to be of this age, as stone celts and hammers have been found in them. But they must have been retained in use at a later period, as in one he mentions the discovery of a stone celt and a bronze sword.† This last circumstance throws some doubt upon an argument which might otherwise be brought to prove the practice of agriculture during the stone period, namely, the frequent occurrence in the *weems* of the quern or hand-mill. These structures are also extremely valuable to the architectural inquirer. "The walls are made to converge towards the top, and the whole is roofed in by means of the primitive substitute for the arch, which characterizes the Cyclopean structures of infant Greece, and the vast temples and palaces of Mexico and Yucatan. The huge stones overlap each other in succession, until the intervening space is sufficiently reduced to admit of the vault being completed by a single block extending from side to side."‡ In addition to the countries mentioned by Dr. Wilson, the same, or analogous, forms have been found in Italy and Egypt, where they have been developed into the real arch, as well as in Sardinia, India, and Peru, where, as in Greece and Yucatan, they appear to have got no further. "It is certainly most remarkable," says a recent writer. "to see exactly the same process, the same strivings after the advantages of an arched construction, going on in such distant regions, where the idea of borrowing from one another is altogether out of the question. . . . These . . . instances . . . show that architecture is in most countries a plant of indigenous birth, and has everywhere passed through the same, or at least analogous stages. The want of the arch was almost universally felt, though it was not every nation that had the ability, or the good fortune to bring their strivings after it to a successful issue."§

* Under the same head, Dr. Wilson treats of those circular foundations of buildings, such as may be seen on St. David's Head, and on Worle Hill in Somersetshire, which surely belong to a later race. Dr. Wilson mentions that in Scotland they are called "Picts' Houses," so in Wales they are known as *Cyrtiau y Gwyddelort*, *Cots of the Gael*; a coincidence which may possibly not be accidental.

† Dr. Wilson in the same chapter, (p. 77,) speaks of a dwelling of another kind in which iron was found, but he brings no evidence that it belonged to the stone period, and he suggests that "the torch of the Roman legionary applied the brand that reduced it to a blackened ruin."

‡ Wilson, p. 70.

§ Freeman's *History of Architecture*, p. 47, *et seq.*

The most important *tombs* of the Stone Period are the famous cromlechs, which, now that the common sense of Mr. Worsaae has once been applied to the subject, we trust no one will again speak of as Druidical altars. Both in Mr. Worsaae's and Dr. Wilson's works will be found numerous examples which must set the question at rest for ever. The general practice during this age was to bury the dead, but towards its close, according to Dr. Wilson,* the practice of cremation was introduced.

The *Bronze Period* is one of very much higher cultivation, as is at once shewn by the fact that it is the analogous stage to that of the heroes of Homer, among whom iron was not absolutely unknown, but bronze was the metal most frequently used. And the use of brazen arms certainly existed down to a much later period, as appears from the well known story of Psammetichus and the soldiers from Ionia and Caria.† But perhaps the people we are most familiar with at this stage are the ancient subjects of the Incas, who shew how high a degree of civilisation may be obtained without the use of what appears to us the absolute necessity of iron.‡ The bronze stage, however, is also found in nations very far behind the early Greeks or even the Peruvians. It was that of the barbarian Massagetæ in the time of Herodotus,§ and seems to have remained among the European Scythians, at least to the time of Philip.¶ Even now we are told that "the most usual weapon of the Hungarian peasant is a small brass axe, closely resembling that of (sic) the antique 'Celts.'"
Both in Greece and Britain this stage is also marked by a great abundance of gold ornaments, silver being very much less in use. Cremation was now general, though not universal. The most remarkable relics of this date are the bronze swords and celts, of the latter of which Dr. Wilson has drawn up an elaborate classification.

Such is a brief view of the archæological facts connected with the two first periods, those of *Stone* and *Bronze*. We do not of course pretend to give here anything like a summary of the evidence on which these results depend, which we recommend our readers to study for themselves in the volumes of Mr. Worsaae and Dr. Wilson. We cannot understand how their general view of the three successive periods of Stone, Bronze,

* P. 70, *et seq.*

† Herod. ii., 152.

‡ Prescott's Peru, i. 139. "The natives were unacquainted with the use of iron, though the soil was largely impregnated with it. The tools used were of stone, or more frequently of copper. But the material on which they relied for the execution of their most difficult tasks was formed by combining a very small portion of tin with copper." That is *bronze* as distinguished from *brass*.

§ i. 215, οὐδέτερον δὲ οὐδ' ἀργύρεον χρεῖσταιναι οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ σφί λαοί οὐ γὰρ χάλκον, ἢ δὲ χερσὶ καὶ ἢ χαλκῷ ἀπλῶς.

¶ Just. ix. 2.

|| Pulszky's Traditions of Hungary, i. 314.

and Iron, can fail to approve itself almost to any mind even without evidence; it really carries its own intuitive conviction with it. And yet a certain class of antiquaries are content to jumble together everything anterior to the Roman invasion, under the meaningless name of Druidical. As Dr. Wilson observes (p. 104) with admirable truth and severity, "the convenient terms of Druid altars and temples have long supplied a ready resource for the absence of all knowledge of their origin and use. The cromlech has at length been restored to its true character as a sepulchral monument, by the very simple process of substituting investigation for theory." Mr. Worsaae has incontestably shewn (p. 85) that the cromlech *could* not have been an altar; the cromlech has been disinterred from beneath its covering of earth, and the barbarian himself has been disinterred from within his cromlech, and yet, with some persons, seeing is not believing. In the same spirit when a primitive boat was recently found, it was pronounced to be a "Druidical coffin;" and to crown all, the occupant of a tumulus in Carmarthenshire, whose skull we imagine would, in Dr. Wilson's hands, have at once proclaimed him an Allophylian, is personally identified with some imaginary British king!!* It is a pity that such inquirers have not the island of Crete for the scene of their investigations; they would surely before long, despite the warning of Callimachus, point out to us the true tokens of the tomb of Zeus.

But, Druids and Druidism apart, we do not see how any one can fail to recognise at the first glance these three periods as following each other in the chronological sequence which we have assigned to each, though we must of course be content with the sequences, without attempting to fix their respective duration. We cannot, however, forbear transcribing two unanswerable passages of Mr. Worsaae:—

"If, without any reference to history, we should seek to determine which of the two metals, copper or iron, was first discovered and used for weapons and tools, we should very readily come to a conclusion in favour of that which is most easily recognised as a metal when in the earth. Now, we know that copper is found in the mines in a state of such comparative purity as to require very little smelting for the purpose of being brought into a state fit for use, while, on the other hand, iron in its rough state looks more like a stone than a metal, and, moreover, before it can be worked at all, must be subjected to a difficult process of smelting by means of a very powerful fire. If we look at the question only on this side, we are forced to conclude, that copper must have been found and employed before

* See *Archæologia Cambrensis*, for April 1851 (p. 159); a publication which usually steers clear of such folly.

iron. And this is confirmed, not only by early historical notices, but also by recent investigations of ancient remains. In Asia, from whence the greater portion, probably all, the European races have migrated, numerous implements and weapons of copper have been discovered in a particular class of graves; nay, in some of the old and long abandoned mines in that country, workmen's tools have been discovered made of copper, and of a very remote antiquity. We see, moreover, how at a later period attempts were made to harden copper, and to make it better suited for cutting implements by a slight intermixture principally of tin. Hence arose that mixed metal to which the name of 'bronze' has been given, and which, according to the oldest writers of Greece and Rome, was generally used in the southern countries before iron.

"That that was the case farther north, and that in Denmark there was once a time—the so-called Bronze-period—in which weapons and cutting instruments were made of bronze, because the use of iron was either not known at all, or very imperfectly, we learn with certainty from our antiquities. We must not however by any means believe that the bronze period developed itself among the aborigines, gradually, or step by step, out of the stone period. On the contrary, instead of the simple and uniform implements and ornaments of stone, bone, and amber, we meet suddenly with a number and variety of splendid weapons, implements, and jewels, of bronze, and sometimes indeed with jewels of gold. The transition is so abrupt, that from the antiquities we are enabled to conclude, what in the following pages will be further developed, that the bronze period must have commenced with the irruption of a new race of people, possessing a higher degree of cultivation than the earlier inhabitants.

"As bronze tools and weapons spread over the land, the ancient and inferior implements of stone and bone were, as a natural consequence, superseded. This change however was by no means so rapid as to enable us to maintain with certainty, that from the beginning of the bronze period no stone implements were used in Denmark. The universal diffusion of metals could only take place by degrees. Since in Denmark itself, neither copper nor tin occurs, so that these metals, being introduced from other countries, were of necessity expensive, the poorer classes continued for a long series of years to make use of stone as their material; but it also appears that the richer, at all events in the earlier periods, in addition to their bronze implements, still used others of stone, particularly such as would have required a large quantity of metal for their formation. In tombs, therefore, which decidedly belong to the bronze period, we occasionally meet with wedges and axes, knives and axes, but most frequently hammers, all of stone, which must have been used at a much later period. A great number of them very carefully wrought, and also bear evident marks of having been bored through with round metal cylinders. But although implements of stone and bronze were at a certain period used together, yet it is an established fact that a period first prevailed during which stone alone was used for implements and weapons; and

that subsequently a time arrived when the use of bronze appears to have been the all-prevailing custom."—Pp. 23-25.

In the other he argues with equal cogency from the sepulchral rites of the successive periods :—

"From the fact that bodies during the bronze period were burned, it may be conceived that the bronze period is later than the stone period, in which it was the general custom to bury the dead without burning. This latter method of interment is peculiar to uncultivated nations, and is unquestionably the most simple and the most natural ; the custom of burning the dead supposes a certain development of religious feeling which is only to be found among such nations as have acquired some degree of civilisation. It was a totally different matter, however, when, towards the close of Paganism in the north, cultivation having obtained a higher grade, men once more adopted the custom of interring their dead without first burning them. This fact by no means invalidates the assertion, that the mode of interment of the stone period is the most ancient. That the stone period extends farthest into antiquity, the tombs which belong to it afford the most unquestionable proofs. At the summit and on the sides of a barrow are often found vessels of clay, with burnt bones and articles of bronze, while at the base of the hill we meet with the ancient cromlechs or giants' chambers, with unburnt bodies and objects of stone. From this it is obvious that at a later time, possibly centuries after, poorer persons, who had not the means to construct barrows, used the ancient tombs of the stone period, which they could do with the more security, since a barrow which is piled above a giant's chamber had exactly the same appearance as a barrow of the bronze period. To prevent misunderstanding it must here be observed, that many persons are of opinion, from the appearance of the barrows when opened, that the different modes of interment of the periods of stone and bronze, the placing bodies in cromlechs and the burning them, prevailed universally at one and the same time. This opinion has, however, been founded in most cases on very loose grounds, since sufficient attention has not been paid to distinguishing the different modes of interment at the base and the summit of the barrows ; for the fact that two kinds of interment occur in the same barrow, by no means proves that such interments belong to the same era. The circumstance, moreover, that together with unburnt bodies vessels of clay have also been found, in the cromlechs and giants' chambers, has given rise to error. These vessels contain, as we have seen, merely loose earth ; but formerly it was constantly as erroneously conceived, that all vessels of clay found in barrows were urns for ashes, and had been filled with burnt human bones. We are certainly not justified in positively denying, that burnt human bones have ever been found in a legitimate grave of the stone period, but experience has hitherto shewn us, that between the tombs of the stone period and those of the bronze period, there exists a difference,

as great, and in fact greater, than that which prevails between the antiquities of the two periods."—Pp. 94, 95.

Our present subject is not ethnology but "Primeval Archaeology;" so we shall not enter into any questions connected with the former, which can be considered as at all directly historical, but shall confine ourselves solely to that obscure branch, which is, in truth, a part of Primeval Archaeology, or, more accurately speaking, constitutes the end of that study. Any questions touching the historic inhabitants of this island, the Celtic and Teutonic tribes, we shall, for the present, postpone. We only wish to call attention to the view, which, greatly in consequence of the labours of Mr. Worsaae and Dr. Wilson, is beginning to be generally received, namely, that the remains of the stone period belong to an entirely extinct race. We have only, previous to this question, to take a very cursory view of the existing population of the British isles, so as to see how its analogies bear on the prehistoric period.

Contemplating the population of Britain as we see it at present, and taking in as part of the picture all that we can learn from recorded history, we get something like the following. Two main races occupy these islands, the *Celtic* and the *Teutonic*, and the earlier possession of the former we may safely set down as a historical fact. Again, we find in the Celtic race two marked branches, the Gael of the Scotch Highlands, Ireland, and the Isle of Man, the Cymry who still remain in Wales and Cornwall, and who existed in historical times through most parts of England, and in comparatively recent ages retained a large district on the western portion of the Scottish border, where they have left their name to an English county. The Teutonic population occupies England and the Scottish Lowlands, and though formed out of a junction of numerous Germanic tribes, and with a strong Scandinavian element in its northern and eastern portions, is a much nearer approach to an ethnological unity than the Celtic. Neither now nor a thousand years back can as much difference be found between Angle and Saxon, or even between Saxon and Northman, as still exists between Gael and Cymry. Taking a glance at the map we see that the great mass of the island is Teutonic, the Celt being driven into the northern and western parts* of Great Britain, and into the island still farther removed from the rest of the world. History tells us, what the state of the case might have told for itself, that the Celt once occupied a much larger portion of the island than at present, and that the invading Teuton has

* That the extreme north of Scotland and the extreme west of Wales are both Teutonic is a singular fact, but, as it arises from comparatively recent settlements, does not affect the general law of their occupation.

dispossessed him of the fairest portion of his patrimony, and driven him into remote corners of the land.

Thus far we cannot well go wrong; but when we see the gradual advance of population from "the eastern cradle-land of man," sweeping, wave upon wave, Celtic, Teutonic, Slavic, with, on the whole, a wonderful regularity, we are tempted to ask two questions: *first*, is it not possible that the Celts themselves were not the first wave, but dispossessed some earlier inhabitants? *secondly*, when we see the wide diversity between the two Celtic branches, may not one of these have stood in the same relation to the other as they both did to the Teuton?

On this last question we cannot now enter. We only allude to it as the subject of the third work on our list, the learned and acute treatise of the able Secretary of the Cambrian Antiquaries being specially devoted to this purpose. We trust, on some other occasion, to point out the happy union of local experience and historical acumen which he has brought to bear on this important question. At present we can only mention, what is of some consequence to our present subject in the way of analogy, that his researches tend strongly to confirm the view entertained by Lhuyd and others, that, of the two Celtic branches, the Gael preceded the Cymry in the possession of the whole of the islands, and have been since driven into the remote portions in which alone we find their historic homes. Gael, Cymry, and Teuton would thus be three successive waves of population, following each upon the one immediately before it in a north-westerly direction.

We have now gone back as far as history and tradition can carry us, and have found the Gael the earliest historical occupants of Britain, the advanced guard of the great Arian migration. They are certainly the oldest race now existing in Britain, probably the oldest that have left any trace even in local nomenclature. But were they the first inhabitants of all? Was the barbarian who harpooned the whale in the Clyde at all the ancestor of the Gael who made the last stand for his nationality at Culloden? As far as history and tradition* goes, he might be; but archæological evidence tells us another story.

There are no ante-Arian races or other than archæological vestiges now existing in Britain; but such is far from being the case on the Continent. On the confines of France and Spain still exist the remnants of the Basque or Euskarian race, which is now recognised as of Allophylian† origin; and there is every

* We cannot build much on the obscure tradition mentioned by Thierry, about an extinct race of hunters, who, "instead of dogs, trained foxes and wild cats for the chase." This sounds like a lower race than the Gael, yet the Welsh tradition would appear to apply to them.

† For this convenient name for undefined non-Arian peoples we need not say we are indebted to Dr. Prichard.

reason to believe that they represent the old Iberians,* and consequently that there is a great non-Arian element in the existing population of Spain. Besides this, traces of their presence are left in the local nomenclature of many other parts of the south of Europe. Moreover, at the opposite end of that continent we find the various branches of the Finnish race, many of which still remain in a state of barbarism, and who appear, in comparatively recent times, to have occupied a much larger portion of the Scandinavian peninsula. We find, then, that in other countries which exhibit the same archaeological phenomena as Britain, and where the Celtic race still exists, as very conspicuously in France, that race was not the first which occupied the country, but had a precursor in a people which is still numbered among existing nations. Again, driven up into a still more remote corner, we find another people, equally or more unconnected with the general population of Europe, and undoubtedly a mere vestige of a once more widely extended race. Hence alone we might be tempted to put together the Finnish hypothesis of Rask,† which represents these detached fragments as vestiges of a great race which once possessed the whole intervening region, but which have been separated from one another by the successive inroads of the various Arian tribes. This alone would make us look for ante-Celtic authors of the earliest antiquities through all the region. But, besides this, we have the anatomical fact that the crania in the tombs of the stone period are not Celtic, but of another character. Again, the use of the cromlech, the tomb of the stone period, is remarkably confined to a well-ascertained region; if that species of tomb were of Celtic origin, we should have expected the limits of that region to have coincided with the territory known to have been possessed by Celtic inhabitants. But this is far from the case. Cromlechs occur throughout a long tract in the west of Europe, chiefly along the coast, in south-western Sweden, Denmark, the British isles, northern Germany, France, and the Spanish peninsula.‡ Of these, Britain, Gaul, and Spain have had Celtic inhabitants, but there is no evidence that the Celts ever settled in any part of Scandinavia; whereas, as Mr. Worsaae says—

"In previous times they had undoubtedly occupied a much greater extent of the present country of Germany, particularly its middle and southern parts, where the names of localities, mountains, and rivers, are very frequently of Celtic origin; in which regions, however, the characteristic cromlechs, with unburnt bodies, instruments of flint,

* This, we need not say, is convincingly shown by Dr. Prichard in the third volume of his *Physical History*. See also Arnold's *Rome*, i. 484.

† See Man and his Migrations, 181.

‡ Worsaae, 102.

and ornaments of amber, have not as yet been found. Had cromlechs of this nature been the most ancient Celtic graves, we should certainly have expected to have found them in the countries first inhabited by the Celts. But what is more, in the west of Europe there appears not to have been any transition from the cromlech to the barrow: they are totally different."—P. 132.

An ingenious philological argument has also been brought by Dr. Wilson. He derives the Celtic word cromlech* from "*cromadh*, (Gaelic,) or *cromen*, (Welsh,) signifying a *roof* or *vault*, and *clach* or *lech*, a stone." He adds that, as the name is Celtic, if the thing be Allophylian, "the old name of cromlech is of recent origin compared with the structures to which it is applied; and of this its derivation affords the strongest confirmation. It is just such a term as strangers would adopt, being simply descriptive of the actual appearance of the monument, but conveying no idea of its true character as a sepulchral memorial."†

We may, therefore, safely conclude, that the monuments of the stone period belong to an ante-Celtic race, and we shall probably not be far wrong in supposing, that the whole cromlech country from Denmark to Portugal was once occupied by an Allophylian race, of whom the Basques are the existing remnant. From Britain and Northern Gaul they were dispossessed by the Celts; from their Scandinavian settlements, apparently by the existing Danes.‡

But a farther question now arises, Were the Basques the earliest inhabitants of these countries, or did they in their turn dispossess some still more remote occupants? This partly turns on the degree of affinity supposed to exist between the Basque and the Finnish nations. Dr. Prichard§ seems to admit an analogy, though a remote one; between their respective languages, and such an one is also said to exist between their skulls; but certainly in other respects it would be an insult to compare the two. The Fins were in the lowest state of barbarism in the time of Tacitus, and have certainly, to say the least, not developed since in the same proportion as the Teutonic and Celtic races. But the Iberians, unlike the Fins, have always had a certain civilisation. And still more, as Mr. Worsaae shows, where the Fins exist, or can be shewn to have existed, as in Norway and the greater part of Sweden, the cromlech does not occur. We may therefore follow Mr. Worsaae in saying,—

"The first people who inhabited the north of Europe were without

* Not from the imaginary Irish Jupiter Tonans, "*Crom*." See *Archæologia Cambrensis*, 1849, p. 311; 1850, pp. 14, 188.

† P. 69.

‡ Worsaae, p. 144.

§ iii. 22.

doubt Nomadic races, of whom the Laplanders, or, as they were formerly called, the Fins, are the remains. They had no settled habitations, but wandered from place to place, and lived on vegetables, roots, hunting, and fishing. After them came another race, who evidently advanced a step farther, since they did not follow this unsettled wandering life, but possessed regular and fixed habitations. This people diffused themselves along those coasts which afforded them fitting opportunities for hunting and fishing: while voyages by sea and agriculture also appear to have commenced among them. This race, however, seems not to have penetrated the interior parts of Europe, which were at that time full of immense bogs and woods: they wanted metal for felling trees, and so opening the interior of the country, for which purpose their simple implements of stone were insufficient. They followed only the open coasts, and the shores of the rivers or large lakes. To this period belong the cromlechs, or giants' chambers, and the antiquities of stone and bone exhumed from them."—P. 134.

Dr. Wilson, in like manner, considers that he has established *two* Allophylian or ante-Celtic races in Britain, with different skulls and different sepulchral rites, and that the latter were a great advance on the former, and probably entered Britain as conquerors. It is a great temptation to look on them as Fins and Basques respectively; but neither does he himself attempt to make out such a case, nor does he supply sufficient data for the purpose; especially since, if we rightly understand him, cremation was introduced by his second Allophylian race. (P. 72.)

Now, who were the men of the bronze and iron periods? At this stage of our argument we are strongly tempted to wish, either that we were writing on Scandinavian instead of British antiquities, or that we had Mr. Worsaae as a direct guide to the latter. It is with the greatest reluctance that we refrain from transcribing his account of these two periods in the north, so irresistibly clear and cogent is every word of his argument. But, unfortunately, from this point his investigations are of comparatively little service to British antiquaries, as from hence the course of immigration in Britain and in Denmark is, as we have seen, completely different. And we have now passed the most valuable portion of Dr. Wilson's book. His great point is, as we have said, in connecting archaeology with geology and anatomy; in the latter stages, which we have now reached, his habit of scattering his conclusions up and down among his data renders it difficult to make out what his conclusions are.

The passage which approaches most nearly to a definite statement is the following:—

"We have seen, in so far as the imperfect data already referred to

afford trustworthy indications of the physical characteristics of the primitive colonists of Britain, that the race of the later era differed greatly from their elder, and probably aboriginal precursors of the primeval period. We must depend not only on the united observations of British archæologists for adding to these ethnological data, but also on continental research for supplying the necessary elements of comparison by which we may hope to trace out the origin of the Brachy-kephalic race of Scotland, to whom it seems probable that the introduction of the primitive metallurgic arts must be ascribed; while it may be that we shall yet be able clearly to associate the full development of these prior to the working of iron, with the intrusion of the Celtic upon the elder Allophylian British races.”—P. 205.

From this we should^f have inferred that the Celts (Gael) first introduced the use of bronze,* and that the Brachycephali (the second or better Allophylian race) learned of them the use, though probably not the manufacture, (Wilson, pp. 205,† 233,) just as in the course of extermination of aborigines which has been carried on by Europeans in so many lands, some portion of the conquerors’ civilisation is extended to the vanquished before he disappears from the earth. Yet some way after he tells us,—

“In the present state of archæological inquiry, it would be presumptuous to assign dogmatically the precise races to which the arts of each period pertain. Still, the indications both of archæological and direct historical evidence manifestly point to the Celtic as comparatively late intruders, and leave us to seek, with little hesitation, in their Allophylian precursors for the metallurgists of the Archaic period. In the Kumbé-kephalic *Allophyliæ*, we may expect to trace the rude primeval workers in stone with undefined sepulchral rites, and no distinct evidences of a faith or hope beyond the grave. Upon this meanly gifted race, the Brachy-kephalic Allophyliæ intruded, bringing with them, in all probability, the knowledge of metallurgic arts, yet effecting their aggressions by such slow degrees that, as we have seen, these arts appear to have reached our northern regions long before the rude aborigines were called upon to employ them in repelling their originators. From these as well as other arguments we infer, that when the earliest Celtic nomades first reached our coasts, they found the older natives already in possession

* Dr. Wilson has, in our eyes, wasted many words in disputing against a proposition in a passage of Mr. Worsaae’s quoted above, implying that the bronze period marked the intrusion of a conquering race, whereas he supposes what he calls a “metallurgic transition,” when bronze and stone were used simultaneously. Now, Mr. Worsaae (pp. 24, 25) most clearly admits a “metallurgic transition;” and, as far as we can discover Dr. Wilson’s meaning, he admits the intrusion of the *Ἰδριε κεφαλοί*, (Brachycephali,) as conquerors. Both seem to us to mean precisely the same thing,—that bronze was introduced by a conquering race, but that the conquered learned to use, if not to work it, before their final extirpation.

† “The weapons and implements,” he acutely observes, “would in many localities long precede the knowledge of the art by which they were formed.”—P. 205.

of weapons of bronze, and familiar with the most essential processes of the metallurgist."—P. 343.

Now we really cannot quite reconcile these passages. Our own *guess*—it is not much more—would be that the Gael or Gwyddyl introduced bronze into Britain—where they discovered its use is another matter—and that whatever knowledge the second Allophylians had of it, was derived from them. The bronze colt and even the leaf-shaped sword, may have been used against the invading Gael, just as the musket of European civilisation may in our own times be seen in the hands of the native barbarians engaged in repelling that very civilisation in its further advances. In Scotland, especially, one can hardly conceive the Gael as greatly circumscribing the territory of the Allophylians till they were themselves sore pressed by the Cymry; so that there may even have been an interval of peace—such peace as we may imagine in such a state of society—during which the *savage* Allophylian may have freely profited by the arts of the *barbarian* Gael.

We are led to this view, that the first Celtic invaders, that is the Gael, must have first introduced bronze implements, by the consideration that the cromlechs belong to the latest and most advanced portion of the stone period. We have seen that they are the work of that second Allophylian people which we have endeavoured to identify with the Basque or Iberian race. But the cromlechs belong wholly to the stone period, though to its latest stage; no metallic articles being, to the best of our knowledge, ever found in them. It seems to follow, then, that the Basque population in Britain had no original knowledge of metals, but that they were introduced by the next race that entered the island, that is, by the Gael or earliest Celts.

If we are right in thus supposing the first Celtic invaders to have introduced the use of bronze, we have now landed on something like historic ground, and the further consideration of the use of iron, whether due to another Celtic race or to a Teutonic immigration, belongs to a subject which we have for the present postponed. The strictly primeval or pre-historic period is now over. Gael and Cymry are existing races, each possessing an existing language and literature, and we are now professing only to deal with those races of men to whose existence no other clue is provided beside the labours of the antiquary. But even with regard to these remoter and darker ages, we would fain have them believe that "lost," is not, as Sir F. Palgrave would teach us "lost," nor "gone, gone, for ever." We endeavour to deduce a theory from facts—facts that cannot lie, and which speak to us more clearly than all the triads and traditions of all the

Druids, Bards, and Ovates, that may have been created from Brute to the last Eisteddfod; we seek not for detailed history, but for truth of another kind, yet no less real than the facts that shine forth most clearly in the noblest contemporary narrative. A truer and deeper philosophy breathes in the following extract.

"How undeniable soever the proposition that the history of a country, that is, a narrative of events and actions connected and chronologically arranged, can be conceived which shall be independent of written materials, or, as they are called, immediate sources, it is not less certain that monuments and remains of antiquity, other than literary, have a just claim to be considered as indirect sources for the same historical result. Even if such may not avail to make us acquainted with new positive facts, if they fail to certify a list of sovereigns, or to fix a series of dates, they may yet serve, collectively considered, to give us a clearer perception of the religion, the culture, the external life, and other particulars of our forefathers, than can be supplied even by the written sources, to which latter no such high antiquity can be ascribed, in which old traditions are mixed up with newer, and which, as they have been committed to writing in later times, must have been liable to many corruptions of the text. The other remains of which we speak, form, some of them, a complement to the literary, extending our knowledge beyond the periods when the latter begin to deserve belief, and sometimes awakening and fortifying conjectures as to emigrations and connexions of nations, respecting which history is silent. But even the mute memorials have a still higher significance for us. They lead us back to the original population of our northern country; they make us live again our fathers' life. A grave mound, a lonely circle of stones, a stone implement, a metal ornament excavated from the covered chamber of death, afford a livelier image of antiquity than Saxo, or Snorie, the Eddas, or the Germany of Tacitus. And will not the explorer of the past contemplate a work of the art of the middle ages with an interest which no record can excite?"

"Accordingly, there never has been a period since our history began to be cultivated and studied but these monuments have formed an object of attention and investigation, although often viewed in a false light, and though the subject has been treated in a tasteless and unscientific manner. . . . But, again, the remains of the past requite the attention bestowed on them, by assisting other scientific purposes than the strictly historical. They assist to answer questions as to the natural history of our northern countries, their people, changes of climate, and the like."—*Guide to Northern Archaeology*, pp. 25, 26.

The last clause brings us back to the most valuable portions of Dr. Wilson's book, on which we cannot help once more pronouncing our hearty commendation.

- ART. VII.—1. *Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature.* By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 2d edit. London, 1837.
2. *Cautions for the Times: Addressed to the Parishioners of a Parish in England by their former Rector.* Published occasionally: Seventeen Nos. 1851-52.

WE have always had a great admiration of the talents of Archbishop Whately, and a very high appreciation of the services which he has rendered to the world by his valuable and voluminous writings. He has written upon a great variety of most important subjects—theological and ecclesiastical, philosophical and political; and upon the discussion of all of them he has brought to bear a very high measure of excellencies, both intellectual and moral. He is possessed of a very rare combination of ingenuity and sagacity, of penetration and soundness of judgment. He has always advocated and practised the fullest and freest investigation of every subject of interest and importance, and has conducted his own inquiries upon most topics with an amount of real fairness and candour which are by no means common in controversial discussions, even among men of integrity and honour. We regard Dr. Whately as occupying a very high place among the educators of the cultivated intellect of the age. We assign to him this most honourable position, not so much because of the amount of important truth which he has taught and commended to men's acceptance—though his services in this respect have been great—but rather because of what he has done, directly and indirectly, by precept and example, in shewing men, how their faculties may be most fully cultivated and most successfully employed in the investigation of truth; in what way the dangers arising from the obscurities and ambiguities of language ought to be guarded against; and what are the spirit and temper in which truth ought to be sought and investigation ought to be conducted. In these respects Dr. Whately has rendered most important permanent services to the community, which entitle him to the admiration, the respect, and the gratitude of all who are interested in the intellectual and moral advancement of society.

We differ, materially and decidedly, from some of Dr. Whately's views upon theological subjects, but we have no sympathy with the persevering attempts which have been made, not only by the Tractarians or Puseyites, but also by the old orthodox party in the Church of England, as they call themselves, to run him down as a heretic. We believe that, whether

tried by the standard of the Sacred Scriptures, or of the symbolical books of the Church of England, Dr. Whately is much more orthodox in his theological sentiments than *these* classes of his accusers, that their charges against him upon this subject are in a great measure hypocritical, and are to be traced, to a large extent, to the unfriendly, and even malignant feeling awakened in their minds by his able and consistent advocacy of liberal principles on ecclesiastical and political matters.

There are some subjects on which we think Dr. Whately has displayed great ability and candour, even when he has not, in our judgment, arrived at sound conclusions regarding them. One of the most striking and important instances of this, is to be found in his giving up the argument commonly adduced by Arminians against Calvinism from the moral character and government of God. Dr. Whately, himself an Arminian, virtually admits that the argument derived from this source, which has hitherto formed almost the whole stock-in-trade of the opponents of the Calvinistic system, is irrelevant and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it does not really bear upon the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, but upon great facts or results actually occurring under God's moral government. The reality of these facts or results is not disputed; and Dr. Whately, in substance, admits, that Arminians are just as much bound to explain them, and as incapable of explaining them fully, as Calvinists are. In short, he admits that the fundamental question between Calvinists and Arminians, so far as concerns its relation to the Divine moral character and government, virtually resolves into that of the existence and permanence of moral evil in the world—a question of which both parties are equally called upon, and equally incompetent, to give a satisfactory solution. It is quite true that Calvinists have often proved all this by arguments which are unanswered and unanswerable. But as we do not remember that the admission was ever before so fully and frankly made by an Arminian, we regard it as most creditable to Dr. Whately's ability and candour, and value it as a most important concession to the cause of truth.

It is honourable to Dr. Whately, that, after reaching the highest rank in his profession, he should continue, while diligently discharging the appropriate duties of his office, to labour for the public good through the press. He has written and published a great deal since he became Archbishop of Dublin, and he could scarcely have given a more satisfactory evidence of his ability and willingness to be still labouring for the welfare of the community, than by preparing and publishing the "Cautions for the Times," mentioned at the head of this Article.

These Cautions have been published occasionally for about a

year and a half past, and now amount to seventeen. They profess to be the productions of several persons; but it is understood that they are composed principally by Dr. Whately, and that they have been all published under his superintendence. As a whole they are quite worthy of his high standing and his distinguished reputation. They contain much important matter, deserving of a wide circulation, because fitted to be eminently useful. The first eight *Cautions* treat of topics connected with the Romish controversy, and the remainder present a very valuable exposure of the tendencies of Tractarianism and of the conduct of its advocates. It is to the first of these topics only that we mean at present to advert, and in doing so we shall consider the *Cautions* in connexion with Dr. Whately's work, entitled "*Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature.*" This work is one of the ablest and most valuable of all those which bear Dr. Whately's name; and he has devoted two of the *Cautions*, the fifth, in two parts, and the sixth, to what is in substance, though it does not profess to be so, a summary or abridgment of the *Essays*.

The first of the *Cautions* is on the subject of the late Papal Aggression. We do not quite concur in some of the views it advocates. Its general tone is adverse to the propriety and expediency of the "*Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*," and we have already had an opportunity of explaining the grounds on which we regard that measure as thoroughly justifiable in itself, and imperatively called for by the whole circumstances of the case.* It is undoubtedly true, as Dr. Whately argues, that Romanism can be effectually and permanently guarded against, not by civil enactments, but only by considerations addressed to the understandings and consciences of men, and that every real infringement upon the principles of toleration is fitted to injure the good cause which it may have been intended to benefit. But even amid the first excitement produced by the Papal aggression, there was no real danger of these truths being overlooked. Dr. Whately's sensitiveness upon this point we regard as unreasonable and exaggerated, and as fitted to produce the injurious effect, of giving an appearance of countenance to the shameless attempt of Cardinal Wiseman and his friends to represent themselves as martyrs in the cause of religious liberty.

In the beginning of the ninth *Caution*, before proceeding to consider the principles of the Tractarian, or, as he calls it, the "*Tractite*," party, the author gives the following statement of the objects of the seven preceding numbers.

* *North British Review*, No. xxix. pp. 281-289.

"We considered (in Nos. II., III., and VIII.) some of the most plausible popular topics advanced by Romish controvertists; and lest it should be thought that we had misrepresented the force of their reasonings, we examined (in Nos. IV. and VII.) a great number of the Tracts which some of the ablest and most dexterous managers of their cause are now busily circulating through England; and we made it (as we trust) pretty plain that, wherever the secret of their success *does* lie, it does *not* lie in the strength of their arguments.

"But the secret of their success is to be found (as we pointed out in Nos. V. and VI.) in the tendency of corrupt human nature towards such a system as the Romish. Each of us has a traitor in his own breast, always ready and willing to open the gate to the enemy. We are all naturally *prone* to those errors upon which Romanism is built; and, in consequence of that natural proneness, too many Protestants have already admitted principles which, if fairly carried out, must inevitably lead to the reception of the whole body of Romish tenets. The seed has been, as it were, already deposited in their minds. It *may* lie long dormant. But as soon as circumstances favour its growth, it will spring up after its kind, and bear the proper fruits of its species.

"You may see a clear proof of this in the progress of what is called the 'Tractite' party towards Romanism."

In the five numbers which discuss "some of the most plausible popular topics advanced by Romish controvertists," and expose the sophistries and misrepresentations of a recent series of Popish tracts, there are some very successful specimens of argumentation, instances in which we think the common reasonings of Romanists are admirably well refuted, at once by clear and sagacious exposition and by felicitous illustration. We select some passages in confirmation of this opinion.

"The truth is, that *our* religion is *the old* one, and theirs the *new*; only *their* corruptions do not wear the garb of novelty, because they came in without being perceived, silently and gently, through a long lapse of time; whereas our *reformation* of them, and restoration of the primitive faith, was made suddenly and all at once. When you scour a room, you remove, in an hour or two, dirt which had been gathering for several days; yet that is only called *keeping it clean*, not changing it; and so, when you wash your face, or brush your clothes. If the corruptions of the Church of Rome had been thrown off one by one, each soon after it came in, no one would have thought such a continual *keeping the Church clean* to be innovation. But, because they were left to accumulate too long, and a great general correction had to be made suddenly and at once, therefore the restoration of the old state of things seems, to ignorant people, the bringing in of a new one.

"What is called 'the change of the style' is a striking instance of *seeming innovation*, which was really a *restoration*, being a return

to the right course, by a sudden correction of a great error that had resulted from the accumulation of imperceptibly small ones. The year contains 365 days and (*almost*) a quarter. To keep the reckoning right an additional day is inserted in February, every fourth (leap) year, to make up the four quarters of a day. But this addition is a *very little too much*; the excess amounting to three days in every 400 years. And this continually increasing error went on uncorrected (in this country) till it amounted to eleven days. In the middle of the last century we corrected it by adopting what is called 'the new style,' and at once cutting off those days; just as one puts forward the hands of a clock which has lost. But this, though it was, in truth, only a *restoration* of the true time, appeared to ignorant people a great and offensive *innovation*, because it was a correction made all at once, of an error which had crept in by little."—Pp. 17, 18.

"But the point which Roman Catholics love most to dwell on is the *weakness of private judgment*, which they represent as a prevailing reason why we should rather give ourselves up to the direction of an infallible guide. In answer to this, several Protestant writers have very well defended the *right* of private judgment; others have preferred to regard it as a *duty*, and in truth the exercise of it is both a *right* and a *duty*; or rather, a right *because* it is a duty. But the most important consideration of all is the *necessity* of private judgment. A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide on his own private judgment, *that one* most important point, which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. And if, by his own shewing, he is *unfit to judge* at all, he can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. And if, accordingly, he will not trust himself to judge even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by *their* judgment thereupon, still he does, in thus resolving, exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is one which, however unfit we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally *judge* that he should *submit his judgment* in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged, 1. That there is a God; 2. That Christianity comes from God; 3. That Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church; 4. That such authority resides in the Church of Rome. Now, to say that men, who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion, is very like saying, that men may have sound judgments of their own *before* they enter the Church of Rome, but that they *lose* all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it."—Pp. 21, 22.

"Again, when Roman Catholics would persuade us to receive their *traditions* of doctrine as certain truths, without examining them by the

test of Scripture, they are fond of reminding us that it is by *tradition* only that we have the Scriptures themselves. But when you meet such persons, you may ask them, whether they would as readily believe the correctness of a report transmitted by *word of mouth in popular rumours*, from one end of the kingdom to another, as if it came in a *letter*, passed from one person to another over the same space? Would they think, that because they would trust most servants to deliver a letter, however long or important, *therefore*, they could trust the same men to deliver the contents of a long and important letter in a message by word of mouth? Let me put a familiar case. A footman brings you a letter from a friend, upon whose word you can perfectly rely, giving an account of something that has happened to himself, and the exact account of which you are greatly concerned to know. While you are reading and answering the letter, the footman goes into the kitchen, and there gives your Cook an account of the same thing; which, he says, he overheard the upper-servants at home talking over, as related to them by the valet, who said he had it from your friend's son's own lips. The cook retails the story to your groom, and he, in turn, tells you. Would you judge of that *story* by the letter, or the *letter* by the story?

"The case of the Jewish Church is an apt illustration of the difference of security in the tradition of Scripture and the tradition of doctrine. The Jews, we know, faithfully preserved the writings of the Old Testament, which were entrusted to them. Nor do Christ and His Apostles ever charge them with corrupting or destroying their sacred books, as no doubt they would have done, if the Jews had been guilty of any such crime. But our Saviour *does* blame them for 'making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions,' and 'teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Might not the Jews argue, in their turn, that if we receive the Old Testament from them, we should also receive their traditions? the *oral* law (as they call it) no less than the *written* law? But our Saviour always teaches the people to bring the traditions of the elders to the test of the written word."—Pp. 23, 24.

"Again, the invocation of *departed* saints, and especially of the blessed Virgin Mary, as practised in the Church of Rome, is a thing plainly contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. For—not to mention that it is at least very doubtful as to some of their so-called saints, whether they ever existed at all—and as to others, whether they were not mere crazy fanatics—and as to others, whether they were not very wicked men—not to mention this, and supposing these 'saints' to have been all really good Christians, you will readily see that asking a *dead* person to pray for you, when you do not know him to be present, is quite a different thing from asking a *living* person to pray for you. The Scriptures never tell us that the dead can hear or know the requests which men make to them; so that asking their prayers *at all* is a piece of 'will-worship' that cannot be justified. We might, for all that appears, just as reasonably go down on our knees and ask a good man in America to pray for us. But when it came to be believed

that a holy person, when *removed from earth*, can hear the addresses of thousands and millions calling on him in all parts of the world, and can know the secret dispositions of mind in each several person that invokes him, this belief did, in fact, *deify* him. Whatever subtle explanations may be attempted of the way in which 'glorified saints' are able to hear, from various regions, and repeat, more prayers in the day than there are minutes in the twenty-four hours, it is plain that at least the great mass of their worshippers must regard them no less as *gods* than the ancient pagans did the beings they worshipped. For the pagans acknowledged that many of the gods whom they worshipped had been MEN; only they fancied that, after death, their souls had obtained great power and influence over the management of things in the world; which is what was meant by calling them *gods*.

"Now, as the Almighty has declared Himself to be 'A JEALOUS God'—just as unwilling to have His honour impaired as if He were jealous of it—and as he always treated the conduct of the pagans in thus praying to dead men as idolatry, it cannot be safe in us to encourage anything like a practice which He abhors; particularly as, even if the saints *can* hear our prayers, there is plainly no *necessity* for praying to them, since God invites us at all times to 'come boldly' to Himself, through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ. It is much *safer*, then, certainly, *not* to pray to the saints, if God has not required us to do so, than to invoke them, especially (as the Roman Catholics do) in the same posture—at the same time—in the same place—and even in the same form of words—as we invoke God Almighty.

"Now, God has nowhere in Scripture required us to invoke the saints. On the contrary, the New Testament seems framed purposely to guard all who are sincerely desirous of following its guidance against such a practice. Though we find, in the book of Acts, narratives of the deaths of the two martyrs, Stephen and James the apostle, the brother of John, there is no mention of their being invoked after death. And when God saw fit to convey his commands to Cornelius, and again to Paul, (Acts x. and xxvii.,) by a created being, it is not one of those blessed martyrs, but an angel that is sent.

"The Virgin Mary, again, is never (but once, Acts i. 14) so much as named throughout the Acts and Apostolic Epistles. Now, this silence respecting her is utterly inconceivable, supposing it had been the practice of the early Christians to pray to her. In the Gospels, again, she is but rarely mentioned. And on three of the most remarkable occasions on which she is mentioned, it is apparently on purpose to discourage anything like adoration of her. At the marriage feast at Cana our Lord checks her interference. (John ii. 3, 4.) And on the two other occasions, (Matt. xii. 50; Luke xi. 27,) he takes pains to impress upon his hearers that, in His sight, the ties of kindred are as nothing in comparison of obedience to God's will."
—Pp. 32, 33.

"Another point in which the teaching of the Church of Rome is plainly contrary to Scripture, is *transubstantiation*.

"Roman Catholics hold that, when Christ, at the last Supper,

taking the bread in his hands, said, 'This is my body,'—he meant, 'This is no longer bread, but is changed into my body.' Such, they say, is the *natural*, because *literal*, sense of the words.

"(1.) But even if it were the *literal* sense, it would not follow from that that it was the *natural* sense of the words. Because the *natural* sense is that (whether figurative or literal) in which the persons, who heard him speaking at the time, would *naturally* and reasonably understand his words. For instance, when, on the same occasion, our Lord said, 'This cup is the New Testament [covenant] in my blood,' neither the Roman Catholics nor we suppose that He meant to speak literally of the cup which he held in his hands: but we both agree that here 'the cup' is put, by a common figure, for the cup-full of wine, which the company were drinking. In this case, therefore, we both agree that the *figurative* sense (not the *literal*) is the *natural* meaning of our Saviour's words. Again, if in explaining a map, I were to point to a part of it and say, 'this is France,' no one would think that I meant that a part of that sheet of paper on canvas was *literally* France; that would not be the *natural* sense of my words. Nor, if I showed you a picture, and said, 'that is the Queen,' would you think I meant to say that it was *literally* Queen Victoria.

"Now it would not have naturally occurred to the apostles, when they heard Christ say of the bread, 'This is my body,' and saw it continue in his hands just the same (to all appearance) as it was before, and when they ate it up, that He was then working a miracle—that He was holding his own body in his own hands, and that they were, each of them, eating up his body, while he sat there all the while conversing with them. But, on the contrary, they would *naturally* have understood Him to be speaking *figuratively*: because they knew that He was then appointing a religious rite; and they (as Jews) were quite accustomed to figurative religious rites. Indeed, they had just been celebrating one such figurative religious rite—the Passover; in which a lamb was eaten, *representing* the lamb which their forefathers had sacrificed on the night they left Egypt; and bitter herbs, *representing* the affliction they had been under; and unleavened bread, *representing* the hastily-made bread which they took with them in their flight, when there was no time to leaven it. And it is the custom still among the Jews for the master of every household to explain to his family, when eating the Passover, the meaning of the rite; saying, for example, when the bitter herbs are laid on the table, 'This is the food of affliction which our fathers ate in Egypt,' &c. The apostles, therefore, would naturally have understood our Saviour to be, in the same way, explaining the meaning of a figurative rite of His religion, and would have taken him to mean—'This bread *represents*, or stands for, my body,' &c. For such a way of speaking is quite common, and was often used by our Lord, when explaining figures. So, in explaining the parable of the tares in the field, He says, 'The field is the world—the good seed is the children of the kingdom—the tares are the children of the wicked one—the reapers are the angels,' &c. Meaning that the field of which he had been speaking stood for, or represented,

the world ; and so of the rest. The apostles, who had often heard Jesus speak thus before, would, therefore, have naturally understood Him to be speaking in the same way then.

“(2.) Did they, then, learn afterwards to put another meaning on His words? On the contrary, we find Paul expressly calling that which is eaten in the communion, ‘bread,’ even after it has been solemnly set apart as the sign of Christ’s body. ‘The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one *bread* and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread [loaf.]’ (1 Cor. x. 16, 17.) And again:—‘As often as ye eat *this bread* and drink this cup, ye do *shew the Lord’s death* till he come. *Wherefore*, whosoever shall eat this *bread* and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, [in a manner unworthy of the solemn rite,] is guilty of [that is, is culpable in respect of] the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *bread* and drink of that cup.’ (xi. 26, 27, 28.) Where he distinctly explains that it is *because*, in eating the bread and drinking the wine at the communion we *shew forth*—exhibit the representation of the Lord’s death, *therefore* he who partakes of it rashly and indecently (as you will find from that chapter the Corinthians did) is guilty of an insult to the Lord’s body and blood, not of mere indecorum at a common meal. The Apostle Paul, then, plainly calls what is eaten at the Lord’s Supper *bread*, even after it had been made a sign or symbol of the Lord’s body. In answer to this the Roman Catholics say, that the apostle speaks *figuratively*, calling it *bread*, because it once was, and still appears so. But it is very strange that men should choose to suspect a figure, in calling that bread, which certainly was, and still seems to all a man’s senses to be real bread; and yet not to suspect any figure in calling that Christ’s body, which was made by a baker, and neither had nor assumes any resemblance whatever to human flesh.

“(3.) But, indeed, the meaning which they (when they explain themselves) give to Christ’s words is not, after all, the *literal* meaning of them. For in common speech we describe things not by their substances (of which we know nothing directly) but by their qualities. We call that bread, which has such a colour, smell, taste, power of nourishing, and so forth. No one would think of calling a mole-hill a mountain, though all the matter of the mountain were pressed into the size of a mole-hill. We should say, in that case, that the mountain had become, or shrunk into, a mole-hill. So, when Moses’ rod assumed the appearance of a serpent, it is said that his rod became a serpent; not that a serpent became his rod. Now, according to the Roman Catholics the *substance* of Christ’s body in the communion has none of the *attributes* of flesh, but appears under all the *attributes* of *bread*. Therefore, in ordinary speech, we should say that Christ’s body becomes bread; not that bread becomes Christ’s body. To suppose our Lord, when He says, ‘This is my body,’ to mean ‘the *substance* of this bread, without a change in any of its qualities, is changed into the *substance* of my body, only *without* any one outward quality of

flesh,' is certainly not to suppose Him to speak *literally*, but in the most dark and perplexed (not to say unintelligible) language that ever was uttered. And to say that this is a *natural* and *obvious* meaning of His words, is what scarce any one would venture to say who had not been carefully *trained up* to believe it such."—1'p. 35-37.

These we regard as very successful specimens of the way in which Popish arguments ought to be dealt with, while they are likewise fitted to impress a general consideration of no small importance in the present day, viz., that the discussion even of what may be called the familiar commonplaces of the Popish controversy, affords abundant scope for the exercise of high and varied talent. There is likewise a masterly discussion of the sacrament of penance and the forgiveness of sins, (pp. 39-44,) but it is too long for quotation.

A great deal is done in the present day to bring the case of the Church of Rome before the community in the most taking and plausible dress it can be made to assume. The counteraction of the efforts made for that purpose is a service which requires, and is entitled to, the best talents the community can produce. Popery can be defended with much greater plausibility than those who are imperfectly acquainted with the subject generally suppose. It is not to be disregarded or despised, as if it were so utterly absurd in every point of view as to be unworthy of serious examination. The series of Popish tracts to which Dr. Whately refers, though, of course, full of sophistry and misrepresentation, are yet got up with a good deal of skill and talent, and possess no inconsiderable measure of plausibility. If they were really read by our Protestant population, they would produce an impression and do no little mischief, unless suitable efforts were made to counteract them, and it is in no way unbecoming Dr. Whately's talents and position that he should have taken the trouble of exposing them.

It is indeed true that the formidableness of Popery as a system of tenets and practices, and the plausibility with which it can be defended, result chiefly from the foundation which it has in some of the tendencies of human nature. Dr. Whately is fully alive to this important consideration, and has illustrated and applied it in some of its aspects with singular ability and success. Indeed, his larger work, the "*Essays*," of which a sort of abridgment or summary is given in the fifth and sixth of the *Cautions*, is devoted to this subject, and to this chiefly we mean to advert in the remainder of the article.

The rise and growth of the Popish system, and its lengthened and extensive prevalence in the world, are well fitted to excite surprise and astonishment, and form a very interesting subject of investigation. When we survey the system in its full and

unrestrained development, as it existed just before the Reformation, and contrast it with the Apostolic Church as exhibited in the New Testament, the conclusion is in a manner forced upon us, that it is fitted if not designed to frustrate the great objects of Christianity as a revelation of God's will while yet professing to acknowledge its divine origin and authority, and to bring back upon the world almost all the evils, in a religious and moral point of view, of the heathenism and the corrupted Judaism that prevailed at the time of our Saviour's appearance upon earth. Polytheism, image-worship, and gross immorality were the great features of heathenism; self-righteousness and superstition or will-worship were the leading features of corrupted Judaism; and these are all to be found in combination as the chief characteristics of Popery when seen in its full development. The history of the world ever since the Fall, makes it manifest that human nature is most prone to all these forms of opposition to God's will and law. All the different revelations which God has given to fallen man were designed to counteract his native tendencies to these things. They succeeded partially, though only partially, in effecting this result. So it was with the revelations which God gave to Adam and his descendants after the fall, to Noah and his sons after the flood, to the people of Israel, through Moses, after the Egyptian captivity, and through the prophets in subsequent generations; and so it has been with the fuller revelation given through Christ and his inspired Apostles. We see, too, under the last dispensation, the old features of heathenism and corrupted Judaism gradually reviving and expanding, and at length covering, and continuing to do so for a long period, nearly the whole professing Christian Church. The tendency to these things in human nature must be very powerful, when it not only countervailed to so large an extent the Christian revelation, but even contrived, in some measure, to make that very revelation instrumental in producing the result. The Sacred Scriptures plainly describe the baneful effects so extensively produced in all these different circumstances as traceable, in some measure, to the agency of Satan, and we are persuaded that it is not possible to explain satisfactorily the rise and growth of Popery, viewed as a mere series of historical events, without taking this scriptural principle into account. The prepossessions and tendencies of depraved human nature account for Satan's success in spreading Popery so widely, in preserving it so long, and in giving it so firm a hold in the minds of men; and his unceasing activity accounts for the completeness and consistency of a system which sprung up gradually, from a variety of proximate causes, and through the instrumentality of a number of men, none of whom had a full conception of the whole system in all its bearings.

This is the representation which Scripture gives of Popery, and a knowledge of it is essential to a full understanding of that great mystery of iniquity. It is only one branch of this general representation that is brought out in Dr. Whately's *Essays on the Errors of Romanism* having their origin in human nature. The great object of the work is to shew, that some of the leading general principles or features of the Popish system have their origin in certain tendencies of man's fallen nature, and that of course they are exhibited more or less by mankind in general, by Protestants as well as by Papists; and the great practical lesson which he deduces from this position is, that Protestants ought carefully to guard against them in their own sentiments and conduct. This object is good, and it is in many respects exceedingly well executed. Much important truth is brought out, and illustrated with great acuteness and sagacity. And, in the practical application of the various topics, many important considerations are suggested to Protestants, well fitted to excite them to self-examination, to guard them against errors, sins, and absurdities into which they are prone to fall, and to lead to the exercise of more forbearance and compassion towards the victims of Popish delusion. All this is good and useful; but we think there are defects and omissions in the work which are fitted somewhat to diminish its value. We have no right, of course, to complain that Dr. Whately did not discuss subjects which did not fall directly within the compass of the one important topic which he selected for discussion, and has discussed so well. But there are some erroneous impressions which the perusal of the work is fitted to produce, and which, we think, should have been more carefully and explicitly guarded against. Where men's attention is fixed through a whole book upon the one position, that the leading features of Popery have their origin in the tendencies of human nature, and therefore exist more or less among mankind in general, among Protestants as well as Romanists, they are apt to rise from it with the impression, that the tenets and practices referred to are not so sinful and dangerous as they formerly conceived them to be. There is nothing in Dr. Whately's book fitted positively to foster this erroneous and injurious impression, but neither is there anything said to guard against it; and this we regard as a defect in the work, though it is not an error to be charged against its author.

Another analogous impression, not unlikely to spring up from the same cause, is this, that since the leading elements of Popery are to be found largely among Protestants, Popery cannot be so *peculiarly* sinful and dangerous as it is sometimes represented to be, and is not, after all, much worse than Protestantism. The

great defect of the work is, that this impression is not carefully guarded against, by bringing out the special, peculiar, and paramount guilt and danger of Popery, with reference to the different topics illustrated. We have no right, of course, to impose upon Dr. Whately the task of expounding at length the special guilt and danger of Popery, but we cannot but regard it as a defect in his work, that it contains nothing to guard against the impression, that no very special guilt and danger attach to it—that Protestantism and Popery are not, after all, very different from each other. We think it of so much importance in the present day, that men should fully and accurately understand what Popery is, that we consider it proper to enlarge somewhat upon this topic, and to endeavour to point out in what way the omission or defect we have noticed in Dr. Whately's work ought to be supplied.

The topics which Dr. Whately selects for discussion and illustration are these:—1. Superstition; 2. Vicarious Religion; 3. Pious Frauds; 4. Undue Reliance upon Human Authority; 5. Persecution; and, 6. Trust in Names and Outward Privileges; and on all these subjects the work contains some very important truths, and some very valuable lessons. It is quite true, as he shews at length, that there is a powerful tendency in human nature to all these errors and sins, and that, therefore, they are to be found among Protestants, and in orthodox Protestant churches. But the exposition and application of this general truth are fitted to produce erroneous and dangerous impressions, unless accompanied with something, at least, of what Dr. Whately's work entirely wants, viz., a clear and explicit assertion of the peculiar and paramount guilt and danger of the Popish system, *in all these respects*, as distinguished from the system of Protestantism.

The special and peculiar guilt of Popery in this matter, as distinguished from Protestantism, lies in this, that, as a system, in place of being fitted and designed to eradicate or correct the depraved tendencies of human nature towards superstition, vicarious religion, pious frauds, reliance on human authority, persecution, &c., *it consecrates, confirms, and perpetuates them*; whereas the general object and result of Protestantism, as a system, are directly the reverse. The exhibition of these qualities in Protestants is in spite of the system they profess, in Papists it is because of it. We do not mean by this that Popery *originates* or *produces* these tendencies, for they exist, as we have admitted, in depraved human nature as such. But the influence of the Popish system, in so far as it is brought to bear upon them, is to strengthen and establish them, while that of Protestantism is to correct and eradicate them; and, therefore,

Popery is to a large extent responsible for the strength with which they act, and the extent to which they operate, among Papists, while Protestantism is *not* responsible for the degree in which they may be exhibited by Protestants.

We have said that the Church of Rome has consecrated and confirmed these depraved tendencies of human nature. She has done so by giving to them, and to their necessary manifestations and results, the sanction, more or less formal and explicit, of the Church, and by providing ceremonies, services, and external arrangements of various kinds, fitted and intended to embody and express them. She has thus given her weight and influence to cherishing and fostering these tendencies in the minds of her people, and to bringing them into full and active operation. We think it worth while to illustrate this general position with reference to some of the leading topics which Dr. Whately has discussed.

1. The first is superstition, a word which is used in a variety of senses, but which is chiefly employed here to designate the tendency to introduce a system of ceremonial observances, to invent or devise unauthorized acts of external worship, and to place some reliance upon them as acceptable to God and fitted to gain his favour, thus virtually comprehending man's natural tendency to idolatry and will-worship. That this tendency exists in the heart of fallen men, has been proved by the history of religion in all ages, though perhaps never more strikingly than in a case where no idolatry, in the stricter meaning of the word, was admitted. We mean the case of the Pharisees in our Saviour's days, who, though they had a system of minute ceremonial observances imposed by God, such as might have contributed to repress the natural tendency to devise rites and ceremonies by largely gratifying it in a legitimate way, were not satisfied without devising and enforcing many traditions on points of ceremonial observance, and relying upon them as pleasing to God. Now it might seem from the representations of the Christian system and the Christian Church, given us in the New Testament, as if it were one design of the new dispensation to counteract this tendency of human nature, not by providing for it, as under the Mosaic system, a certain amount of legitimate gratification, but by prohibiting and extirpating it. This was manifestly the object of our Saviour, adopted in the exercise of infinite wisdom. Disregard of this object, springing from the tendency of human nature which has been so fully developed in every age, shewed itself at an early period in the Christian Church, and was more and more extensively acted upon as time advanced. Now, how has Popery dealt with this? It has fostered and cherished it to the uttermost, by every species of contrivance

which ingenuity could invent. It has introduced practically gods many and lords many, polytheism and image-worship, and thus withdrawn the undivided homage and reliance of men from the one God and the one Saviour. It has fabricated five false sacraments, and ascribed their institution to Christ. It has overloaded the two sacraments which he did institute, with a mass of useless and profane ceremonies, the mere inventions of superstition, and has ascribed to the outward acts and signs effects which Christ and his Apostles never ascribed to them. And, in addition to all this, it has introduced innumerable matters of external ceremony and observance into the worship of God, and urged them upon men as pleasing to him, and beneficial to them. *This* is the peculiar guilt of Popery, this the special danger to which it exposes men in the matter of superstition or will-worship. It has fostered the natural tendency of depraved men by providing for it most abundant, though unlawful, gratification, by throwing around all the materials it has provided for the gratification of this sinful and dangerous tendency, the most solemn sanctions of religion, and thus encouraging men to engage in a constant round of idolatrous and superstitious, and therefore sinful practices; under the delusion that they are thereby propitiating God, and meriting his favour.

Now it is quite true that this superstitious tendency being natural to fallen man, indications of its presence and operation sometimes appear among Protestants, and that, therefore, it is right and proper to warn them against it. But the great distinctions that ought to be ever remembered and kept in view, are these:—*1st*, That the *tendency* of the Popish *system* is to foster and cherish this tendency of depraved human nature, by providing abundant materials for its gratification, and by falsely ascribing to them a divine origin, and a beneficial, if not meritorious, efficacy; whereas the *tendency* of the Protestant *system*, like that of the Apostles, is to suppress and eradicate it, by prohibiting and discountenancing the inventions of men in the worship of God—by promulgating the great scriptural principle, that nothing ought to be introduced into divine worship which God himself has not sanctioned, and that any deviation in practice from this principle is, in place of being acceptable to God, most offensive in his sight; and *2d*, That the practical results of this tendency have been immeasurably more extensively and offensively exhibited in the Church of Rome than ever they have been among Protestants.

Another feature of superstition to which also Dr. Whately adverts under this head, is the natural tendency of men to indulge in unwarranted speculations, and in unfounded hopes and fears, on matters connected with death and the invisible world.

And to this the same general observations apply. Popery has laid hold of this tendency, and has made provision for strengthening and confirming it, while the influence of Protestant views is wholly directed to correcting and eradicating it. This may be briefly illustrated, first in regard to death, and then in regard to the invisible world. It seems to be a natural tendency of men when death appears to be approaching, to grasp at some easy, short-hand method of being in some measure prepared for that event and its consequences, and to seek something of the satisfaction of having made this preparation. Now, this tendency is no doubt too often exhibited in a painful and distressing way among ignorant and irreligious persons who call themselves Protestants, by sending for a minister of religion to pray with them on their deathbed,—a service, in some cases inexpressibly painful from the apprehension, not unreasonably entertained, that in spite of full warning the dying sinner may pervert it into a cause or ground of fallacious hope. But Protestantism is not responsible for this. She has done nothing, either by her doctrines or her practices, to foster or cherish this tendency; they are all directly opposed to it. How different is the case with Popery. She has adroitly laid hold of this natural tendency, and has fabricated the sacrament of extreme unction, without a shadow of scriptural authority, for the purpose of giving it embodiment and expression, thus practically, whatever formal explanations she may give when called upon to defend this doctrine, pandering to an erroneous and dangerous tendency, consecrating and confirming it by religious solemnities, invented for the purpose, or at least taken from a different matter and applied, without reason, to this, and in this way practising a ruinous delusion upon the souls of men.

It is a tendency of human nature to shrink from the idea of men's everlasting condition being irrevocably determined at the period of their death, and to seek for some definite knowledge of what immediately succeeds death, under a vague hope that this may hold out to them some further opportunity of probation, or at least of preparation for happiness. Protestants have adhered to the guidance of the Word of God in giving no countenance or toleration to these dangerous tendencies, and in constantly proclaiming what is the substance of all that God has been pleased to reveal to us upon the subject, viz., that men's eternal destiny is irrevocably determined at the period of their death, and that all men then enter upon a state of happiness or of misery, which, in no instance, is ever thereafter to change its general character. Whereas the Church of Rome has, to some extent, adapted her teaching to this erroneous and dangerous tendency of human nature, and holds up before men the intermediate state of purgatory, in which they are to be pre-

pared, by penal inflictions, for the enjoyment of heaven. She has not indeed in this matter so directly contradicted the doctrine of Scripture, as to deny that it is irrevocably settled at the period of men's death whether they are ultimately to go to heaven or to hell; for she teaches that all who are admitted into purgatory reach heaven at last. But no one who is acquainted with human nature, and who duly estimates the natural tendency which we are now considering, will entertain any doubt that the Romish doctrine of purgatory has, in innumerable instances, deadened men's sense of moral responsibility, their appreciation of the certain consequences of death, and led many to cherish the delusive hope, that through a process of posthumous purgation they would reach heaven at length, when they had no scriptural ground for this expectation. There is a tendency in human nature to desire, and to believe in, an opportunity of purgation after death; and it is an indication of this tendency, that the Jewish Rabbins have also been in the habit of teaching the existence of a purgatory. But they were honest, stupid bunglers compared with the skilful and unscrupulous fabricators of the Popish system; for they have limited the period of men's endurance of the pains of purgatory, in all cases, to twelve months, and they further teach, that nothing can in the meantime be done for them on earth to shorten its duration,*—points of contrast with the Popish doctrine, the bearing of which upon the influence and interests of the priesthood is too obvious to need to be pointed out.

2. We have dwelt, however, long enough upon this subject of superstition, and must now advert to the next topic which Dr. Whately discusses, that of vicarious religion. That there is a tendency in human nature leading men to place some reliance with reference to their future and eternal prospects on the supposed worth and excellence of other men, on what some one or more of their fellow-men have done, are doing, or will do for them, is confirmed by abundant experience. And it cannot be denied that indications of the operation of this most erroneous and dangerous tendency occasionally appear among men who call themselves Protestants. But here, too, Protestantism is free from blame. There is none of her doctrines or practices that has the slightest tendency to encourage this vicarious religion,—the tendency of all of them is directly the reverse. Protestantism holds in the fullest and most unqualified sense, that God alone can forgive sin—that Christ is the only sacrifice, the only priest—that he alone could render any satisfaction to divine justice—that it is solely on the ground of the relation into which men may have been brought to him, and of what He has done or will do for them—that

* Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*, liv. v. c. 17-20.

any of them can escape merited punishment or receive any mark of God's favour, and that every man must bear his own burden. And while Protestantism holds all these doctrines in their fullest sense, she teaches nothing which has any tendency to neutralize or modify them, or to obstruct their full practical operation upon men's minds. Whereas the Church of Rome, accommodating herself to this natural tendency of men towards a vicarious religion, and anxious to devise pretences for encouraging and strengthening it, has invented tenets, and embodied some of them in outward ordinances, the manifest tendency of which is to subvert or neutralize, at least, the practical influence of those great doctrines of God's Word which we have just described as maintained by Protestants. Romanists profess, indeed, to teach all that is laid down in Scripture, upon these subjects, and they do not in words contradict it. But they give such perversions of the Scriptural doctrines, and they join to them so many additions of their own of an *opposite* bearing and tendency, that they can be clearly proved in some points to subvert or contradict them even in argument or speculation, and in other points where perhaps this cannot be made out so plainly, it can at least be shown that their tenets, when viewed in connexion with men's natural tendency to a vicarious religion, are well adapted, practically and with reference to the mass of mankind, to confirm it. The Church of Rome teaches that her priests have the power of forgiving sins, and this not only declaratively, but judicially and authoritatively. Romanists acknowledge other mediators besides Christ, not indeed, as they are accustomed to say, other mediators of redemption, but, as they admit, other mediators of intercession. They teach that men may perform works of supererogation, deeds of excellence over and above what may be necessary for securing to themselves admission to heaven without passing through purgatory, and that these works of supererogation may be made available for the spiritual welfare of others than those who performed them, the intervention, however, of some act of the Pope or of his agents being made necessary in order to effect this; and that one man may give satisfaction for another by paying what is due by him in the way of temporal punishment inflicted by God for sin. In short, the Church of Rome teaches explicitly that no one is admitted to "Heaven unless the doors be opened by the priests to whom God has committed the keys."* And not only are all these doctrines explicitly taught as portions of divine truth, but many of them are embodied and exhibited in outward ceremonies and observances, fitted and intended to give them a stronger hold of men's minds, and to

* Ut enim locum aliquem ingredi nemo potest sine ejus opera cui claves commissae sunt, sic intelligimus neminem in coelum admitti, nisi fores a sacerdotibus, quorum fidei claves dominus tradidit, aperiantur.—Cat. Rom. P. ii. c. v. Sec. 57.

make them more practically influential upon their feelings and conduct. Indeed, it may be said with truth, that the whole aspect and complexion of the Romish system are adapted to, and fitted to strengthen and confirm, the natural tendency of fallen men to a vicarious religion, to a reliance in the matter of their salvation, on those on whom they have no warrant from God to rely. The Church will tell us, and her subjects may repeat the assertion, that they rely only on Christ for salvation; and that there are men in the Church of Rome who are practically and substantially relying on Christ alone, we do not doubt; but where this reliance on Christ alone really exists among them, it is in opposition to the general tendency and the ordinary results of the system of their Church. The manifest tendency of the Romish doctrines above described, is to withdraw them from exclusive reliance upon Christ, and to lead them to trust in their fellow-men. Indeed the sum and substance of Popery, considered practically and as exhibited among the mass of men in countries where it has full and unrestrained operation, is just this, that the priest virtually undertakes to secure the salvation of the people, upon condition that they give themselves up wholly to his guidance, and submit implicitly to his will. Neither priest nor people would openly profess this, or admit it in words; but no one who is familiar with the real sentiments, the practical impressions, and the actual hopes and fears, of the mass of ordinary papists, will deny that this is the actual general result of the system when it is really embraced; and the more carefully men examine the system itself in the light of God's Word, and in connexion with the powerful tendency of depraved human nature to a vicarious religion, the more firmly will they be convinced, that this practical result is one which it is admirably adapted to produce.

3. The next topic which Dr. Whately has discussed is that of pious frauds. And here we fully admit the truth of his leading position, which is this,—

“The tendency to aim at a supposed good end by fraudulent means is not peculiar to the members of the Romish Church, it is not peculiar to those who are *mistaken* in their belief as to what is a good end; it is not peculiar to any sect, age, or country; it is not peculiar to any subject-matter, religious or secular, but is the spontaneous growth of the corrupt soil of man's heart.”—P. 149, 2d edit.

There is a natural tendency in men to act, more or less consciously, upon the principle that the end sanctifies the means, that a desire to effect a good object may justify, or at least palliate, some deviation from the strict rules of integrity and veracity; and some traces of this lurking practical Antinomianism occasionally find their way even into the hearts of pious men. It is on this account right and proper to warn all men against

it. But we must not overlook the *peculiar* guilt of Popery in this matter. Protestantism has given no countenance or sanction to this depraved tendency. Protestantism holds no principles, and countenances no practices, that are in any measure fitted to encourage and strengthen it; and it is impossible to find, *to any considerable extent*, in the writings or in the actions of Protestants, examples or defences of its application. Whereas, on the other hand, we are fully entitled to say, that the Romish system is fitted to foster, and has actually fostered, this natural depraved tendency to the practice of pious frauds, and no other warrant is needed for the assertion than these undoubted historical facts:—1st, That Popish writers have more frequently and more explicitly defended the practice than any other body of men that ever existed; and, 2d, That this tendency has been more fully exhibited in actual operation in the Church of Rome than anywhere else. These are facts which can be established by conclusive evidence, and they prove that the Church of Rome is in some way or other chargeable with *peculiar* guilt in sanctioning and fostering this depraved tendency. She is chargeable with those results as to writings and actings which we have described. They are undoubted features of her historical character, and she cannot escape from the guilt which they imply. No productions of heathen or infidel writers exhibit such bold defences of fraud and falsehood as can be produced from the writings of Jesuits. The history of heathenism can produce no such exhibition of every kind and degree of fraud, practised professedly for the advancement of religion, as is unfolded in the history of the Church of Rome, and as can be brought home to the Popish ecclesiastical authorities. This the Sacred Scriptures warrant us to expect to find in the Romish system, and this, accordingly, impartial history fully develops there. This is enough to show that, whenever pious frauds, as indicating a natural tendency of depraved men, are made the subject of discussion in connexion with the errors of Romanism, it is right and necessary to bring out the important and undoubted facts, that Romish writers alone, or nearly so, have defended such frauds, and that Romish ecclesiastics have practised them more extensively than any other body of men who can be comprehended under a specific designation.

But we can not only infer the tendency of the Popish system to foster the natural tendency of the human heart to practise pious frauds, from the results as exhibited in history, we can lay our hands upon the roots and ingredients of the tendency, as developed in the system itself. These are to be found in the Popish doctrines of the distinction between mortal and venial sins, and of the right of the ecclesiastical authorities to grant dispensations of oaths and

vows, doctrines which, whatever glosses or explanations may be given of them for controversial purposes, have a most direct and powerful tendency, especially when viewed in connexion with the natural leanings and inclinations of depraved men, to produce a very inadequate sense of the difference between right and wrong, and to make men regard certain deviations from the laws of integrity and veracity as innocent and harmless. These Romish doctrines, skilfully adapted to men's depraved tendencies, are well fitted, and amply sufficient, to produce *the fraud*, and then the *piety*, such as it is, is furnished in abundance by another feature of the Popish system, viz., the constant and zealous inculcation of the paramount regard due to the prosperity of the Church as an outward visible society, and the obligation to subordinate everything to the promotion of her interests. These features of the Popish system, taken in combination, and viewed in connexion with men's natural tendencies, which they are manifestly fitted to encourage and strengthen, fully explain the undoubted fact, which the history of the Church of Rome presents to our contemplation, viz., that Popish writers have defended, and that Popish ecclesiastics have countenanced and practised, pious frauds, to an immeasurably greater extent than any body of men that ever existed. And this fact contrasts very oddly with the claim which Romanists are accustomed to put forth on behalf of their Church to peculiar and pre-eminent sanctity, as a note by which she is plainly and palpably marked out, even to the eyes of men, as the true and only Church of Christ, amid all the societies which claim to themselves that character.

4. The next topic which Dr. Whately discusses is undue reliance on human authority in religious matters, as connected with the Romish claim to infallibility. His Essay on this subject contains some very valuable and sagacious remarks in support of the position, that the errors of Romanism, speaking generally, were not originally deduced from those texts of Scripture which are now usually brought forward in defence of them, but that after they had sprung up from other causes, and especially the natural tendencies of the human heart, these texts were pressed into the service. This is a very important truth, and it is well brought out in the following extracts:—

“The infallibility of the (so called) Catholic Church, and the substitution of the decrees of Popes or of pretended General Councils, for the Scriptures, as the Christian's rule of faith and practice, is commonly regarded as the foundation of the whole Romish system. And it is so, in this sense, that if it be once admitted, all the rest must follow: if the power of ‘binding and loosing’ belong to the Church of Rome in the extent claimed by her, we have only to ascertain what are her decisions, and to comply with them implicitly.

"But I am convinced that this is not the foundation, *historically* considered, (though it is *logically*,) of the Romish system;—that the Romish hierarchy did not, in point of fact, first establish their supremacy on a perverted interpretation of certain texts, and then employ the power thus acquired to introduce abuses; but resorted, as occasions led them, to such passages of Scripture as might be wrested to justify the prevailing or growing abuses, and to buttress up the edifice already in great measure reared."—Pp. 183, 184.

"Whatever slight differences, however, there may be among Protestants as to the precise sense of these passages, and of all that our Lord has said on the subject, they all agree in this—that it will by no means bear the interpretation put on it by the Romanists; who are commonly supposed, as has been above remarked, to derive from their mistaken view of our Lord's expressions in this place, the monstrous doctrines of the Universal Supremacy of the Church of Rome and her infallibility as to matters of faith. I have said that these doctrines are *supposed* to be thus derived, because there is good reason to think that such is not really the case; and that in this point, as in most of those connected with the peculiarities of Romanism, the mistake is usually committed of confounding cause and effect. When there is any question about any of the doctrines or practices which characterize that Church, it is natural, and it is common, to inquire on what rational arguments, or on what Scriptural authority, these are made to rest; the reasons adduced are examined, and, if found insufficient, the point is considered as settled: and so it is, as far as regards those particular doctrines or practices, when judged of by an intelligent and unbiassed inquirer. That which is indefensible *ought* certainly to be abandoned. But it is a mistake, and a very common, and practically not unimportant one, to conclude, that the *origin* of each tenet or practice is to be found in those arguments or texts which are urged in support of it;—that they furnish the cause, on the removal of which the effects will cease of course—and that when once those reasonings are exploded, and those texts rightly explained, all danger is at an end of falling into similar errors.

"The fact is, that in a great number of instances, and by no means exclusively in questions connected with religion, the erroneous belief or practice has arisen first, and the theory has been devised afterwards for its support. Into whatever opinions or conduct men are led by any human propensities, they seek to defend and justify these by the best arguments they can frame; and then, assigning, as they often do, in perfect sincerity, these arguments, as the cause of their adopting such notions, they misdirect the course of our inquiry. And thus the chance (however small it may be at any rate) of rectifying their errors, is diminished. For if these be in reality traceable to some deep-seated principle of our nature, as soon as ever one false foundation on which they have been placed is removed, another will be substituted; as soon as one theory is proved untenable, a new one will be devised in its place. And in the mean-

time, we ourselves are liable to be lulled into a false security against errors whose real origin is to be sought in the universal propensities of human nature."—Pp. 187-190.

"Again, if the Romanists are urged to defend and explain their practice of praying for the souls of the departed, they refer us to the doctrines of their Church respecting Purgatory. But it is not really the doctrine of Purgatory which led to prayers for the dead; on the contrary, it is doubtless the practice of praying for the dead that gave rise to that doctrine—a doctrine which manifestly savours of having been invented to serve a purpose. Accordingly it never, I believe, found its way into the Greek Church; though the use of prayers for the dead (difficult as it is to justify such a practice on other grounds) has long prevailed in that Church no less than in the Romish.

"If, again, we call on the Romanists to justify their invocation of saints, which seems to confer on these the divine attribute of omnipresence, they tell us that the Almighty miraculously reveals to the glorified saints in heaven the prayers addressed to them, and then listens to their intercession in behalf of the supplicants. But the real state of the case, doubtless, is, that the practice which began gradually in popular superstition, and was fostered and sanctioned by the mingled weakness and corruption of the priesthood, was afterwards supported by a theory too unfounded and too extravagantly absurd to have ever obtained a general reception, had it not come in aid of a practice already established, and which could be defended on no better grounds.

"And the same principle will apply to the greater* part of the Romish errors; the cause assigned for each of them will in general be found to be in reality its effect;—the arguments by which it is supported to have gained currency from men's partiality for the conclusion. It is thus that we must explain, what is at first sight so great a paradox, the vast difference of effect apparently produced in minds of no contemptible powers, by the same arguments;—the frequent inefficacy of the most cogent reasonings, and the hearty satisfaction with which the most futile are often listened to and adopted. Nothing is, in general, easier than to convince one who is prepared and desirous to be convinced; or to gain any one's full approbation of arguments tending to a conclusion he has already adopted; or to refute triumphantly in his eyes any objections brought against what he is unwilling to doubt. An argument which shall have made one convert, or even settled one really doubting mind, though it is not of course necessarily a sound argument, will have accomplished more than one which receives the unhesitating assent and loud applause of thousands who had already embraced, or were predisposed to embrace, the conclusion."—Pp. 191-193.

"It is, on many accounts, of great practical importance to trace, as far as we are able, each error to its real source. If, for instance, we supposed the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be really founded, as the Romanists pretend, and as, no doubt, many of them sincerely

believe, on the words 'This is my body,' we might set this down as an instance in which the language of Scripture, rashly interpreted, has led to error. Doubtless there *are* such instances; but I can never believe that this is one of them; viz., that men really were *led* by the words in question to believe in Transubstantiation; for besides the intrinsic improbability of such an error having so arisen, we have the additional proof, that the passage was before the eyes of the whole Christian world for ten centuries before the doctrine was thought of. And again, if we suppose the doctrine to have, in fact, arisen from the misinterpretation of the text, we shall expect to remove the error by shewing reasons why the passage should be understood differently: a very reasonable expectation, where the doctrine has *sprung from the misinterpretation*; but quite otherwise, where, as in this case, the *misinterpretation has sprung from the doctrine*. When there was a leaning in men's minds towards the reception of the tenet, they of course looked for the best confirmation of it (however weak) that Scripture could be made to afford.

"There is no instance, however, that better exemplifies the operation of this principle, than the one immediately before us—the Romish doctrines of the Universal Supremacy, and Infallibility, of their Church. If we inquire how the Romanists came so strangely to mistake the passages of Scripture to which they appeal, we shall be utterly bewildered in conjecture, unless we read backwards the lesson imprinted on *their* minds, and seek for the true cause in the natural predisposition to look out for, and implicitly trust, an infallible guide; and to find a refuge from doubts and dissensions, in the unquestioned and unlimited authority of the Church. This indeed *had* been gradually established, and vested in the Romish See, before it was distinctly claimed. Men did not submit to the authority because they were convinced it was of divine origin and infallible; but, on the contrary, they were convinced of this, because they were disposed and accustomed so to submit. The tendency to 'teach for doctrines the commandments of men,' and to acquiesce in such teaching, is not the effect, but the cause of their being taken for the commandments of God."—Pp. 195-197.

There is a natural tendency in men to rely on the authority of others in religious matters; and indifference, laziness, and timidity,—influential elements of character, taken as a whole, in the mass of mankind,—all go to strengthen this tendency, if they may not rather be said to constitute and produce it. There is a desire natural to men, of some easy and expeditious way of getting rid of their doubts and difficulties, and attaining, without much trouble or research, to some authoritative foundation on which they think they may securely rest. This tendency is fitted to lead to error and danger, because the Word of God does not sanction it, and makes no provision for men attaining, in this way, to a certain knowledge of the truth; while, from the numerous temptations

to error which beset men from without and from within, those who indulge this tendency, and the elements out of which it grows, will be very apt to go astray, and to become the prey of designing men, who may advance unfounded but plausible claims to the submission and obedience of their understandings. Protestantism is decidedly opposed to this erroneous and dangerous tendency. It not only does not appeal to it, or seek to derive from it any advantage, but its principles, based upon the Word of God, tend directly to counteract and eradicate it, by urging the necessity of men coming into direct and immediate contact with God himself and his Word in the matter of their salvation. and by denying, openly and fully, that the exercise of any authority, properly so called, in religious matters, is lawful, or that God has appointed any man, or body of men, whose decisions on these subjects are to be implicitly obeyed. The Church of Rome, on the other hand—and here lies her peculiar guilt in this matter, while it is one chief means by which she has kept men under her sway and gained many to submit to her claims—has skilfully pandered to this natural tendency of men, has given it the fullest and most solemn sanction, has habitually availed herself of its influence, and made the most ample provision for strengthening, by exercising it. In endeavouring to establish the general position, that it is desirable and necessary that there should be a permanent judge authorized to settle all controversies in religion, the Romanists commonly appeal not to Scripture—for it affords no countenance to the idea—but just to this very tendency of human nature, and to those low and grovelling influences to which we formerly referred, as encouraging, if not producing it. In laying down the general position, that infallibility is necessary in order to the right execution of what are generally admitted to be the ordinary proper functions of the Church as an organized society, and of the Christian ministry collectively considered, including the decision of religious controversies, they are skilfully addressing themselves to the same general tendency, and making the fullest provision for gratifying and confirming it. And that this is one of the ultimate objects or final causes of the claim which they put forth to infallibility, is *not* disproved by the partial inconsistency into which some Papists have been led by their disputes among themselves as to the seat of infallibility, viz., the assertion that the decisions of the Pope, as undoubted head of the Church, are to be obeyed by all the faithful, whether he be personally infallible or not.

Here, again, we see the peculiar guilt of the Popish system, and the special danger with which it is attended. Men, ignorant and depraved men, have a strong natural tendency

to place an undue reliance upon human authority in religious matters. God guards us against this tendency in his Word, by discountenancing all reliance upon mere human authority, by appointing no authoritative judge of religious controversies, and giving no hint of the desirableness or necessity of such a provision, by requiring men to come into immediate contact with his own Spirit and Word, ~~that~~ they may correctly and certainly know his mind and will, and by demanding that every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. "The Church of Rome sets itself in opposition to all this, takes this erroneous and dangerous tendency of depraved human nature under its fostering care, gives it all the sanction of its authority by holding it up as a principle of religion, encourages men's indifference, sloth, and cowardice by persuading them to act upon it, and thus contrives to lead many men, without almost any sense of responsibility, without any careful examination, and with scarcely any knowledge of the grounds on which they are proceeding, to give themselves up to dangerous error. The iniquity of the Popish system in this respect, may be regarded as exhibited in a concentrated and practical form in the simple and well-known fact, that the Popish authorities are in the habit of circulating in this country a pamphlet called "The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for embracing the R. C. religion," and that the last of his reasons is expressed in these words:—"The Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves—an assurance I never could extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence I inferred that the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of these sects that have divided from it."*

It is right to warn Protestants and all men against undue reliance upon human authority in religious matters, for none are free from danger in this respect; but it is not right to overlook the special and pre-eminent guilt which the Popish system, as distinguished from the Protestant, has incurred in this matter, and the peculiar danger with which its influence is attended.

5. The fifth topic which Dr. Whately discusses, in illustration of the general principles of his book, is persecution. It is fully conceded, that there is a tendency in human nature to persecute

* This is copied from an edition of the pamphlet published at London in 1822 by Keating and Brown. It continues in great repute and general circulation. It is given entire, filling sixty pages, as an appendix to the first volume of a Popish work of great pretensions, published at Paris in 1847, entitled "Lettres au Clergé Protestant d'Allemagne," by Mousseigneur Luquet, Evêque d'Hezelen.

because of differences of opinion upon religious subjects, to treat these differences as injuries or insults to ourselves, and to punish them as such ; and then this natural tendency is often strengthened and confirmed by erroneous and perverted impressions of the obligations under which men lie to God and to His truth, and of the way in which these obligations ought to be discharged. There is scarcely any one of the errors of Romanism that has a deeper foundation in human nature than this, or any one which more readily allies itself with some of the better feelings of our nature, and which can produce a larger amount of apparent, though only apparent, countenance from Scripture. And accordingly there was no one of the errors and evil tendencies of the Romish system that adhered more firmly, or for a longer period to Protestants, than this. But while it is admitted that this tendency to persecute is natural to men, and has been often exhibited in practical operation by Protestants as well as Papists, and while on this account it is right that *all* men should be warned against yielding to its influence, we should not overlook the special and peculiar guilt of Popery with reference to this, as well as all the other depraved tendencies of human nature.

Now, the first and most obvious consideration which presents itself in illustration of this, is in substance the same as that which we adduced under the head of *pious frauds*, viz., that Papists have more openly and generally defended, and more extensively and recklessly practised persecution, than Protestants, or any other body of men, have done, from which we infer that the Popish system is better adapted to encourage and strengthen this natural tendency than the Protestant or any other system. Protestants have seldom if ever been guilty of wholesale murders of large masses of human beings professedly upon mere grounds of religion, while these atrocities are common in the history of the Church of Rome. Protestants, even when most deeply imbued with this deplorable error, have usually restricted their violence to heresiarchs, or to ringleaders in heresy, whom they regarded as leading other men astray ; while Papists have been accustomed to make scarcely any distinction between the misleaders and the misled, and to involve as far as they could all who they thought had gone astray from truth in one common destruction. Protestants have never been guilty of the folly and absurdity of compelling men to embrace the true religion, as if a mere external profession of what was right could be really honouring to God or beneficial to men,—their sin in this matter has been restricted to punishing and removing out of the way individuals who they thought were extensively injuring the souls of others ; while Papists have been in the habit of disre-

guarding these distinctions, overleaping these barriers, and persecuting men in masses, avowedly for the purpose of forcing them into the true fold of Christ.

These are great aggravations of the iniquity of Romanists, as distinguished from that of Protestants, in regard to this matter of persecution, and confirm the inference we have drawn, that the Popish system must be peculiarly adapted to call forth and to strengthen this natural tendency of depraved men, and to give it an extensive influence over their conduct. This is enough for our purpose, even if we could not point any specific features in the Popish system on which this peculiar fitness to call forth, to encourage, and to strengthen, men's natural tendency to persecute, was based. But there is no difficulty in doing this. The principle of subordinating everything to the interests of the Church, as a visible organized society, has just as strong a tendency to produce persecution as to produce pious frauds; and the virtual substitution of the visible Church in the room and stead of Christ, which is a leading feature of the Popish system, is well fitted to consecrate and to confirm this tendency. The supposed possession of infallibility tends to produce in men a reckless disregard of the claims and rights of others, and a pressing, at all hazards and against all opposition, of their own. The notion that opposition to the Church involves a forfeiture *de jure* of ordinary civil rights and privileges, of property and life, has been long deeply ingrained in their system, and has been acted upon whenever, and in so far as, circumstances seemed to render it expedient; while their notions about the bearing and consequences of external communion with the true visible Church, have no doubt seemed to them to give a sanction to persecuting proceedings, which would otherwise have been seen to be foolish and absurd, and which, as we have explained, no Protestants have ever adopted. It will not do, then, to slur over this matter of persecution, as is now-a-days a common and fashionable practice, merely by saying that there is a strong tendency in human nature to persecute, and that Protestants have persecuted as well as Papists. This is true, but it is not the whole truth, and it is right that on this point, as on every other, we should bring out the peculiar guilt and danger of the Popish system as distinguished from the Protestant,—of the Church of Rome as distinguished from Protestantism,—in cherishing and fostering the depraved tendencies of human nature, instead of mortifying and subduing them, and, as a consequence of this, in exhibiting in point of fact far more extensively their baneful and ruinous operation, both on the temporal and spiritual welfare of men.

There is nothing in Dr. Whately's *Essays on Romanism* inconsistent with the representations we have now given of the

system, and we have no reason to doubt that he would concur in the whole substance of what we have said. But we cannot but regard it as a defect in the work, that some little pains was not taken to guard against the impression, not unlikely to be produced by it, that Popery is not very much less safe and innocent than Protestantism, and that there is not even an *assertion* of the peculiar and life-eminent guilt of Popery in reference to the topics discussed.

In addition to this general defect, there is a more specific omission of a somewhat peculiar kind, in the non-introduction of what is commonly known by the name of self-righteousness in its bearing upon the doctrine of justification. The general omission on which we have animadverted is not mentioned or referred to by Dr. Whately, probably because it was not very directly suggested by the leading object which he proposed to himself in the composition of the work. The discussion, however, of the topic of self-righteousness, according to the views generally entertained of it by the Reformers and by Calvinistic and Evangelical divines, lay so directly in the line of the course of investigation to which the work is devoted, that it was scarcely possible to omit it, without adverting to the omission and giving some explanation of its cause. Accordingly Dr. Whately has devoted the Appendix B to an exposition of his views upon the subject of self-righteousness, and of the reasons why he did not discuss it in the body of the work, as an illustration of the "errors of Romanism having their origin in human nature." This appendix we regard as containing no small amount of serious error, and as manifesting something less than Dr. Whately's usual candour and fairness. We do not deny that there have been instances among those who have held the doctrine of the Reformers with respect to justification and self-righteousness, in which that latent and insidious spiritual pride, which he exposes, has been manifested, and we willingly acknowledge that there are some of his statements upon this subject from which these persons may learn some useful lessons of warning. But we consider it unwarrantable to make statements, as he seems to do, fitted to convey the impression, that this is the natural tendency and the appropriate result of the views on this point which he opposes, and that it characterizes generally those who advocate them. The most important question, however, connected with this subject, is as to the soundness and accuracy of his reasons for omitting to give a distinct and prominent consideration to the subject of self-righteousness, meaning thereby, an undue and unwarrantable reliance upon our own good deeds as a means of obtaining the forgiveness of sin and the enjoyment of God's favour. The substance of what he lays down on this

point may, we think, be fairly enough comprehended in these two propositions,—1st, That a tendency to self-righteousness, in the sense above explained, is neither very common nor very dangerous, and, 2d, that the Romanists teach no very material error upon this subject, “though they may perhaps have made an injudicious use of the word *merit*.”

The examination of these positions would open up a wide field of theological discussion, on which we cannot at present enter. But we must say, that we regard the maintenance of them as amounting to a virtual denial of the great doctrine of justification as taught by the Reformers and by the Apostle Paul, and as a deplorable specimen of the anti-scriptural views in regard to it which have generally prevailed in the Church of England since the time of Bishop Bull. There was no subject on which the Reformers were so unanimous, or to which they attached so much importance, as the doctrine of justification, including the exposition of the place which good works hold in the scheme of salvation. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans, at the period of the Reformation, were all persuaded that the Church of Rome taught very serious error upon this subject, and they were of one mind as to what was the doctrine taught in Scripture concerning it. If Dr. Whately's opinions upon this subject are correct, the Reformation, in the very matter to which its authors attached the highest importance, must have been founded wholly in misapprehension and error. For more than a century after the commencement of the Reformation, the divines of the Church of England continued to believe that the Church of Rome had very materially perverted the doctrine of Scripture upon this point. This is evident from two great works in which this subject is minutely investigated, viz., Bishop Davenant's “*Praelectiones de Justitia habituali et actuali*,” published in 1631, and Bishop Downam's “*Treatise of Justification*,” published in 1633. In these two works, the best and fullest scholastic discussions of this subject which Britain has produced, it is proved that the Church of Rome teaches very material and dangerous error in regard to the place which men's good deeds hold in the scheme of salvation, while, incidentally, it also appears from them, that the defenders of the doctrine of the Reformation upon this topic, had Papists for their only antagonists, and met with no opposition from any of their own brethren. When Protestants began to corrupt the doctrine of Scripture and of the Reformation, by inculcating those views on the subject of justification which Dr. Whately maintains, the Papists raised a shout of triumph, and adduced the fact as a concession, at length extorted by the force of truth, to the effect, that there was no very material difference upon this point be-

tween Protestants and the Church of Rome, and that of course one fundamental article in the theology of the Reformers was based upon misrepresentation and falsehood.*

Ever since the time of Bishop Bull, very erroneous views upon the subject of justification have been widely prevalent in the Church of England—views in substance the same as those taught by the Church of Rome. Those who hold these views cannot but admit, as Dr. Whately does, that the Church of Rome teaches no very material error upon this subject, and, of course, must maintain, if they would speak out, that the Reformers were defeated in argument by the Romanists, in that very matter which they reckoned the article of a standing or a falling church. It is true that the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent upon this subject, are drawn up with a good deal of caution and cunning, and are well fitted to deceive those who have not thoroughly investigated it. But in the writings of the two great divines to whom we have referred, and in those of other old divines of the Church of England who might be mentioned, it is proved, we think, beyond the possibility of answer, that the Church of Rome does teach very serious error upon this important subject; and that the general scope and tendency of all the error she teaches, is just to cherish and foster self-righteousness in men's minds, that is, to lead them to place a reliance upon their own good works as a means of obtaining forgiveness of sin and the favour of God, which the Sacred Scriptures not only do not sanction, but condemn and denounce. The history of religion in every age and country seems to us to make it manifest, that there is in human nature a powerful tendency leading men to place a measure of reliance upon their own good deeds—their own compliance with the laws of morality—as a means of obtaining pardon and acceptance from God, which is clearly precluded by the whole substance of what is taught in Scripture, concerning men's natural state of guilt and sinfulness, and concerning the remedy which has been provided for it. And the truth of this position is in no degree invalidated by the truth of another, viz., that men have a strong natural tendency to rely unduly, with the same view, upon their external religious observances, and, even to substitute the observance of religious ceremonies for the performance of moral duties. These two tendencies are perfectly consistent with, and mutually auxiliary to, each other. And in adducing and establishing against the Church of Rome, the charge of fostering and cherishing men's natural tendency.

* A proof of the truth of this statement, and an interesting specimen of the use made by Romish controversialists of the renunciation by Protestants of the doctrine of the Reformers on the subject of justification, will be found in the work of the celebrated Jansenist Nicole, entitled "*Préjugés Légitimes contre les Calvinistes*," a. xi. p. 270-6.

to self-righteousness, we have no difficulty in shewing that it encourages men to rely unduly and unwarrantably *both* on good works or external conformity to the moral law, and on outward ceremonies. It does the former by its anti-scriptural doctrines as to the meaning, the nature, the causes, and the grounds of justification, and by an error on the subject of the *merit* of good works, going very far beyond what Dr. Whately calls, "the *perhaps* injudicious use of a word." It does the latter by inventing and imposing a host of unauthorized rites and ceremonies, and teaching men to regard them as conveying and conferring grace. There is perhaps no more striking proof of the strength of this tendency than its prevalence in a large section of professedly Christian and Protestant society. If we investigate the state of mind of the great body of those whom we see around us in the world, not the openly profligate but the externally decent, we will be satisfied, that the more ignorant they are of religion, and the more indifferent they are habitually to all their responsibilities and obligations as immortal beings, the more are they disposed to rely upon their own good deeds, or external observances, as a ground of hope towards God.

There is, then, in human nature, a powerful tendency to self-righteousness. The Popish system, in place of seeking to eradicate this, as evangelical Protestantism does, is fitted to confirm and extend it. And there is no one aspect in which Popery can be contemplated, better fitted to illustrate its injurious bearing upon the spiritual welfare of men, than when we survey those of its tenets and practices above referred to, in connexion with that tendency of human nature to which they are so skilfully accommodated. The Apostle Paul seems to have found this strong natural tendency of men to self-righteousness, to be the great obstacle to the success of his labours; and the experience of most men who have rightly understood the real nature of the Apostle's object, and who have adopted *his* method of seeking to effect it, has been of a similar kind. It was this tendency to self-righteousness, that was most influential in making the preaching of Christ crucified a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks. It is still true, we fear, in regard to multitudes to whom Christianity has been made known, that "they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." (Rom. x. 3.) And this statement of the Apostle's applies perhaps more fully and emphatically to the victims of Popish delusion, than to any class of men within whose reach Christianity has been brought. The whole system is fitted to keep them in ignorance of God's righteousness, to encourage them to go about to establish their own righteousness, and thereby to prevent them

from submitting unto God's righteousness, the only scheme or provision by which sinners can be saved. If there be any principle better entitled than all others to a place in an exposition of the depraved tendencies of human nature in which the errors of Romanism originate, and if there be any error of Romanism against which it is peculiarly important to warn Protestants, it is self-righteousness, or an undue reliance upon good works and religious observances as a means of procuring forgiveness and acceptance from God.

There is one of Dr. Whately's colleagues on the Irish episcopal bench, who holds what are, in our judgment, much more Scriptural views on the subject of justification and good works, and the relation in which they stand to each other, viz., Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Ossory. Dr. O'Brien has rendered an important service to what we believe to be the cause of truth in this matter, in his work entitled "*An Attempt to Explain and Establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only.*" The revival in the Church of England of the scriptural doctrine of the Reformers upon this important subject, has found in Dr. O'Brien a worthy representative and advocate. His work is an able and learned defence of what we believe to be the true doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures, of the whole body of the Reformers, and of the authors of the symbolical books of the Church of England, upon the subject of justification. It is peculiarly valuable to the theological student, because of the fulness with which it adduces the evidence, that the Reformers unanimously maintained, in opposition to the Romanists, those views upon that subject which have been generally rejected by the divines of the Church of England ever since Bishop Bull's time.*

Dr. Whately in a note to the above-mentioned Appendix, (pp. 368, 369,) gives a brief indication of the general method by which he would attempt to show that the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, did not teach the doctrine on the subject of justification which the Reformers deduced from his statements, and plainly hints, that by the very same process it might be shown, that the Reformers did not teach the doctrines which have been generally ascribed to them, by those who have most highly valued, and most carefully studied, their writings. "It is in substance this, that the Apostle, in discussing the subject of justification, was dealing with men who did not place their reliance for pardon and acceptance upon their good works properly so called, upon the performance of moral duties, upon any conformity, even in external action, to the moral law, but merely upon ceremonial

* This very valuable work of Dr. O'Brien's is out of print, and cannot be procured. Why is it not reprinted? What has become of Dr. O'Brien's promised *History of the Doctrine of Justification*? This is a noble subject, and in his hands would be most useful and interesting.

observances, and that the Reformers had to do with a similar class of persons and of notions. He says,

"The error which is perhaps the commonest among Protestants upon this point, is that of forgetting that the 'works' by which the Pharisees sought to establish their own righteousness, 'which was of the law,' were not the performance of moral duties, but ceremonial observances."—P. 368.

And again,—

"An error very nearly the same had crept in among us to a vast extent before the Reformation. 'Good works' had come to signify principally, if not exclusively, pilgrimages, fasts, genuflexions, and ceremonial observances of various kinds; and hence our Reformers use much the same language as the Apostle Paul, with the same meaning, and on a like occasion."—P. 369.

The notion which Dr. Whately seems to intend to convey by these statements is, that *the works* which Paul and the Reformers so absolutely excluded from the matter of justification, to which they so strenuously denied all justifying efficacy, were merely ceremonial observances. He admits, indeed, that "to found a claim to immortal happiness, on the ground of morality of life, would have been an error," and that both Paul and the Reformers "were well aware that virtuous actions can never give a man a claim to the Christian promises, independently of Christian faith; and also that the best actions—in themselves the best—are not acceptable in God's sight, (indeed are not even morally virtuous at all,) independently of the principle from which they spring." But these are statements to which no Romanist would object; and we are not at present considering the whole subject of justification, or Dr. Whately's views concerning it, but merely adverting to the interpretation he puts upon a portion of the language employed by Paul and the Reformers, in treating of it. And with reference to this point, we regard as fully warranted the statement we have made, viz., that he is of opinion, that the works to which Paul and the Reformers so strenuously denied all justifying efficacy were ceremonial observances. It is well known that this is one of the interpretations which have been proposed and advocated, for the purpose of showing that Paul taught the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and not the doctrine of the Reformers, upon the subject of justification. We have no hesitation in saying, that we regard it as the most indefensible of all the misinterpretations of the Apostle's language that have been put forth with that view. We cannot at present discuss this matter upon its merits; but we think it right to state, that this interpretation of the Apostle's language has been generally rejected by the more judicious of those, whether Romanists or Protestants, who have concurred in the main in Dr. Whately's opinions on the subject of justification. Car-

dinal Bellarmine, in treating of this point, says, "Some Catholics teach that, by the *works* which the Apostle excludes from justification, must be understood the observance of legal ceremonies, circumcision, the Sabbath, new moons, &c. But it is the uniform opinion of St. Augustine, and without doubt it is most true, that by works which are opposed to faith, and are excluded from justification, must be understood the works which precede faith, and are performed by the mere power of free will." (*De Justif. lib. I. c. xix.*) *Bishop Bull's leading positions upon the subject are these:—1st, That by *works* the Apostle understood obedience to the whole Mosaic law; 2d, That in discussing the Mosaic law as a whole, and showing that obedience to it could exert no efficacy in procuring justification, he at the same time exposes some Jewish dogmas which had been combined with it; and, 3d, That as he had also to do with the Gentile philosophers, he argues also against the works of the natural law, or obedience rendered to the moral law by the mere powers of nature, without divine grace, though he does this only incidentally, and by the by. (*Harmonia Apostolica Dissert. ii. c. vi., pp. 93-100.*) It seems to us very manifest, that the works which Paul excludes from any efficacy in procuring justification, include all this *at least*; nay, we have no doubt it has been proved, that they include not merely obedience to the whole law of Moses, the moral as well as the ceremonial part of it, not merely works externally conformed to the moral law proceeding from men's natural powers without faith or grace, but also, moreover, absolutely and universally, obedience to law as law, conformity to legal requirements as such. All this, we believe, the Apostle excludes from the matter of justification—to all this he denies any efficacy in procuring for men the forgiveness of their sins and the enjoyment of God's favour.

The chief grounds on which Dr. Whately seems to found the interpretation he gives of the Apostle's language are, that he was disputing with the Pharisees, that therefore his words must be understood only in the sense which the work of refuting them requires, and that they were openly immoral men, who did not profess to rely upon their good works or external morality, but only on ceremonial observances. We object both to the general principle of interpretation indicated in this mode of arguing, and to the application which is here made of it. We do not deny the importance of ascertaining as fully as possible the precise and immediate object which the inspired writers had in view in

* Tam hoc manifestum est, ut cum olim nonnulli ex Romanæ ecclesiæ addictis hæc exceptione uti sint, Præsum, Rom. iii. 28, alibi que, opera solum legis ceremonialia a justificatione excludere, recentiores tamen, quam parum illi insit laboris animadvertentes, aliam hinc se expediendi ingressi sunt viam. J. F. Buddæi Ecclesiæ Apostolica, c. iii. a. iii. p. 181.

the statements they made upon any occasion, and the propriety of applying this for the purpose of bringing out the meaning and bearing of what they may have said. But we maintain that there is no improbability in the idea, that men, whether inspired or uninspired, may, in discussing a particular subject, be led on to make statements more wide and comprehensive than what the precise topic with which the discussion started obviously suggested, or necessarily required, and that they may use language, in the course of the discussion, so plain as to make the fact that they had been led to do this, altogether unquestionable. We believe that the Apostle's language so clearly and certainly excludes from the ground of justification obedience to the whole Mosaic law *at least*, that we would feel ourselves constrained to ascribe this doctrine to him, even though he had commenced his argument by expressly telling us, that he was about to expose the reliance which the Pharisees placed on ceremonial observances. But there is no ground whatever for believing that this was his sole or even his principal object. He was dealing not so much with the practice as with the doctrine of the Pharisees, and we have conclusive evidence that they professed to rely for acceptance with God upon their obedience to the whole Mosaic law, and taught that this was a legitimate and valid ground of confidence. The application which Paul makes of his own case and character while a Pharisee, ought to have precluded the whole process of thought on which Dr. Whately grounds his misinterpretation of the Apostle's language.*

Dr. Whately's statement, that "our reformers used much the same language as the Apostle Paul, with the same meaning, and on a like occasion," is plainly intended to convey the notion that the "good works" which they excluded from all efficacy in procuring forgiveness and acceptance, were merely outward ceremonial observances. This notion we believe to be entirely unfounded, to be wholly inconsistent both with the historical facts as to what they had to oppose in the Church of Rome, where the meritorious efficacy of repentance and moral duties in procuring the Divine favour was openly proclaimed, and with the true and plain meaning of their own statements as to what they intended to teach.

There is one other feature in Dr. Whately's Essays which we would like to notice, though we have not now space to dwell upon it. He presents an interesting and important view of the Popish system in the following passage:—

* For a full investigation of the erroneous notions on the subject of justification and good works that generally prevailed in the Apostolic age, both among Jews and Gentiles, and for a conclusive proof, as we think, that all that can be ascertained upon this point, confirms decidedly the interpretation put upon Paul's language by the Reformers, we refer to two eminent divines, the first a Calvinist, and the second a Lutheran, Witius and Buddaeus. See Witius's *Miscellanea Sacra*, tom. i., Exercit. xx. xxi. xxii. xxiii., and Buddaeus's *Ecclesia Apostolica*, c. iii. s. iii.

“The peculiar character of Romanism (and also of the religion of the Greek Church) in this respect, will be best perceived by contrasting it with Mahometism. This latter system was framed, and introduced, and established, within a very short space of time, by a deliberately-designing impostor; who did indeed most artfully accommodate that system to man’s nature, but did not wait for the gradual and spontaneous operations of human nature to produce it. He reared at once the standard of proselytism, and imposed on his followers a code of doctrines and laws ready-framed for their reception. The tree which he planted did indeed find a congenial soil; but he planted it at once, with its trunk full-formed and its branches displayed. The Romish system, on the contrary, rose insensibly like a young plant from the seed, making a progress scarcely perceptible from year to year, till at length it had fixed its root deeply in the soil, and spread its baneful shade far around.

In fecunda quælem, sed læta et fortia surgunt;
Quippe sola natura subest;

it was the natural offspring of man’s frail and corrupt character, and it needed no sedulous culture. No one, accordingly, can point out any precise period at which this ‘mystery of iniquity’—the system of Romish and Grecian corruptions—first began, or specify any person who introduced it. No one, in fact, ever did introduce any such system. The corruptions crept in one by one; originating for the most part with an ignorant and depraved *people*, but connived at, cherished, consecrated, and successively established, by a debased and worldly-minded ministry; and modified by them just so far as might best favour the views of their secular ambition. But the system thus gradually compacted, was not the deliberate contrivance of any one man or set of men, adepts in priestcraft, and foreseeing and designing the entire result. The corruptions of the unreformed Church were the natural offspring of human passions, not checked and regulated by those who ought to have been ministers of the Gospel, but who, on the contrary, were ever ready to indulge and encourage men’s weakness and wickedness, provided they could turn it to their own advantage. The good seed ‘fell among thorns,’ which, being fostered by those who should have been occupied in rooting them out, not only ‘sprang up with it,’ but finally choked and overpowered it.”—Pp. 7-9.

There is, no doubt, a great deal of truth in this passage, and in others to the same effect which occur in different parts of the work. But we are disposed to think that the statement as a whole is somewhat exaggerated, and to assign a larger share of influence to the priesthood in devising and fabricating the Popish system. Not only did the priests share equally in the same natural tendencies which led the people to desire and to welcome the system of tenets and practices which constitutes Popery, but they were, for many reasons, much more likely to give to the appropriate results of these tendencies the fullest expression and

the most ample encouragement. * It is a view of Popery that ought never to be overlooked, that its tenets and practices, individually and collectively, though they have their origin in human nature, are also admirably adapted to increase the influence and promote the selfish interests of the priesthood, a fact which indicates pretty plainly the source to which their growth and development are to be mainly ascribed. And there is another view of Popery that ought never to be forgotten, viz., that all its peculiar tenets and practices, while having their origin in human nature, and while fitted and designed to increase the influence of the priesthood, are also adapted to lead men to form erroneous views of the doctrines inculcated and the duties enjoined in the Sacred Scriptures. They thus tend to prevent men from making a right use and improvement of the Revelation which God has given them, and in this way to endanger their spiritual and eternal welfare. There are thus three leading general views of Popery, all of which must be taken into account in order that we may thoroughly understand and appreciate that most marvellous system. Its tenets and practices have their origin in certain tendencies of human nature, and this view is fitted to impress those useful practical lessons which Dr. Whately has so well illustrated. They are all fitted, equally and at once, to promote the two great objects of advancing the influence of the priesthood and endangering men's spiritual welfare. The most remarkable thing in the history of Popery is, that, gradually, during a long series of years, and through the labours of many individuals, not acting on a preconceived plan, a system should have grown up, which is admirably compacted and thoroughly consistent in all its parts, and which, in all its provisions and arrangements, the most minute as well as the most important, is fitted to secure the two great objects to which we have referred. We are persuaded, as we have already intimated, that this can be explained only by means of the principle, which appears to us to be clearly taught in Scripture, viz., that Popery, in its complex character and as a system, is Satan's great scheme for frustrating the leading objects of the Christian revelation.

Such efforts are made in the present day to diffuse defective and unduly favourable views of the Popish system, and so many influences combine to promote the success of these efforts, that we have considered it our duty to dwell chiefly on those parts of Dr. Whately's *Essays and Cautions* which may possibly be employed to aid in advancing this object. We have animadverted on them freely and plainly, but we trust that in doing so we have said nothing inconsistent with the high admiration we entertain and have expressed of his great talents, or with the profound sense we cherish of the value and importance of the services he has rendered to the world by his writings.

- ART. VIII.—1. *First Report of the Commissioners for the Exposition of 1851.* London, 1852. 8vo, pp. 267; with Plates.
2. *Education and Educational Institutions considered with reference to the Industrial Professions, and the Present Aspect of Society.* By the Rev. J. BOOTH, LL.D., F.R.S., Chaplain to the Marquis of Lansdowne. London, 1846. 8vo, pp. 108.
3. *Papers relating to Proposals for Establishing Colleges of Arts and Manufactures for the Better Instruction of the Industrious Classes.* By T. A. LLOYD, F.R.S., F.G.S. London, 1851. 8vo, pp. 40. Printed for Private Circulation.
4. *On the Importance of studying Abstract Science with a View to its Future Practical Application: Being an Introductory Lecture at Putney College.* By LYON PLAYFAIR, F.R.S., F.C.S. London, 1848. 8vo. Printed for Private Circulation.
5. *Notes on the Organization of an Industrial College for Artisans.* By T. TWINING, Jun. In a Letter to Lord Shaftesbury. London, 1851. Printed for Private Circulation.
6. *Suggestions for a Crystal College or New Palace of Glass for combining the Intellectual Talent of all Nations; or a Sketch of a Practical Philosophy of Education.* By W. CAVE THOMAS. London, 1851, pp. 64.
7. *How much longer are we to continue teaching nothing more than what was taught two or three Centuries ago? or ought not our highest Education to embrace the whole Range of our Present Knowledge? and ought not the Education of all Classes to have a direct Reference to the Wants of our Free, Busy, and Enlightened Age?* By the Rev. FOSTER BARHAM ZINCKE, Vicar of Wherstead. London, 1850, pp. 42.
8. *Why must we educate the Whole People? and what prevents our doing it?* By the Rev. FOSTER BARHAM ZINCKE. London, 1850, pp. 54.
9. *Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures, fondée en 1829.* Paris, pp. 42.
10. *Report of the Head Master of the Government School of Design at Sheffield on the National Exposition of Manufactures at Paris.* (In the Annual Report of the School.) Sheffield, 1849.
11. *Records of the School of Mines, and of Science applied to the Arts.* Vol. i., Part i. Inaugural and Introductory Lectures to the Courses for the Session 1851-52. Published by order of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. London, 1852. 8vo, pp. 148.
12. *Lectures on the Results of the Great Exhibition of 1851, delivered before the Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Com-*

merce, at the suggestion of H.R.H. PRINCE ALBERT, President of the Society. London, 1852. Pp. 634.

THE Exhibition of 1851 is now an event of the past. Its gems of Nature and of Art have disappeared, and the crystal casket which inclosed them is about to return to its elements, and to assume, under another sky, a more permanent character and a nobler form. Like the hero who dies in his glory, or the sage whose name is embalmed amid the great truths which he has bequeathed to his race, the Exhibition of the World's Industry rises on the page of history when its material elements have fallen; and long after its crystal roof has ceased to dazzle, its cherished memories will put forth more hallowed and more enduring radiations. The transparent chrysalis has burst, and we must now study the future being to which it has given birth.

Had the Exhibition of 1851 been a mere pageant to please the eye of its visitors, and to gratify the vanity of the nation;—or had it been simply a palace of the arts to amuse and to instruct the public, it would, under either aspect, have exercised a salutary influence over our social condition, and its founder would have well deserved both individual and national gratitude. The motives, however, by which Prince Albert was influenced, and the ends which he had in view, were of a higher and nobler kind. Educated as British princes and British statesmen had never been educated—uniting with the elegant acquirements of literature and the fine arts a sound knowledge of the physical and natural sciences, and of the mechanical arts with which, in foreign lands, the sciences have been long associated, he perceived the defects in our intellectual institutions; and occupying that high position from which truth can speak without giving offence, and reform emanate without inspiring fear, he conceived the idea of turning the attention of the nation to the state of its manufacturing arts, and giving a new direction to its science, and a fresh impulse to its industry.

During the early half of the present century, after war had ceased to usurp the talent and exhaust the resources of the State, a few individuals of ardent patriotism and enlarged views called the attention of the nation to the humble condition of its industrial and scientific arts, and to the feeble and ill-directed efforts of our scientific and educational institutions. In the pages of the two great Reviews which shed their light quarterly over the land, these truths were often pressed upon the public notice; and this Journal has not been behind its rivals in appreciating the importance of practical science, and in advocating its claims to national recognition and support. But facts and arguments, reproof and exhortation, made no impression on the advisers of the Crown; and the members of the Legislature

were equally callous to the demands of science and of art. The seeds of truth, however, even when sparingly sown, never fail to germinate. Though buried for centuries and unproductive, they yet spring into life under the inspiration of the elements, and often cast into the social granary a rich and abundant produce.

The Metropolitan Society of Arts, which had long been the only, though the feeble patron of inventions and useful discoveries, had been stimulated into activity by the accession of a few patriotic and zealous members. The Royal Scottish Society of Arts, established in Edinburgh, became a powerful auxiliary in the cause of practical science. The mechanical institutes, too, throughout the kingdom:—the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge—the British Association for the Advancement of Science, including Mechanics and Civil Engineering—the Amendment of the Patent Laws, which we owe to Lord Brougham—the splendid Exhibition of the Manufactures of Birmingham in a large temporary building—the Government Schools of Design—the Agricultural College at Cirencester—the College of Practical Science at Putney, under the patronage of the Duke of Buccleuch—and the Museum of Practical Geology, with its School of Mines and of Science applied to the Arts—were all important steps in the onward march of British industry. But valuable and progressive as these steps were, they were nevertheless but insulated steps in divergent directions, proceeding from no centre, and pointing to no goal. Private interests, professional prejudices, and local necessities, combined to keep the scientific institutions of the country beyond their sphere of mutual attraction; and the voluntary character of almost all of them, and the general absence of pecuniary aid, and consequently of control, on the part of the State, prevented the establishment of some central institution round which they might cluster, and from which they might derive new life and energy.

But while these institutions were developing their powers and displaying their results, the English Government, neglecting the very interests of which it was the guardian, made no attempts even to improve and extend the national colleges and institutions over which it had control. The Scottish and even the English Universities, with a staff of able professors, whose talents might have received a fresh impulse and a better direction, were allowed to stand unchanged amid advancing civilisation, while the academical institutions of other lands were embracing, with extended arms, those various courses of study which administer to the wants of social and domestic life, and promote the glory and prosperity of nations. When practical science was wanted by the British Government, it was collected by the most expensive process in committees of Parliament, often from ill-informed and interested witnesses, and consigned

to blue books to which few had access, and whose contradictory hieroglyphics still fewer could understand. If there was one nation in the civilized world, for which an opposite course might have been expected, that nation was England. Her naval pre-eminence;—her lines of steamers connecting her shores with the remotest regions of the earth;—her Saxon tongue the vehicle of liberty and truth over half the globe;—her colonies swelled, and swelling into gigantic kingdoms;—her commercial greatness, and the enormous extent of her manufacturing establishments, all concurred in demanding from England a willing patronage of the arts and sciences—a generous treatment of the men who advanced them, and a munificent endowment of the establishments which they required.

In support of these views, let us take a rapid glance at the progress of industrial institutions in France. The illustrious Descartes had at an early period recommended the establishment of public lectures for artificers and workmen. He proposed that each group of trades should have a lecture-room, with its hall of tools and models, and a practical lecturer to explain the manipulations of their art to the students, and solve the difficulties which might embarrass them. At that time, even, there was a large collection of machines under the charge of the Academy of Sciences, which had been transferred to the Louvre, where it had remained for nearly a century, till the intellectual energies of a new era brought it into use. The celebrated mechanist M. Vaucanson, to whom we owe the remarkable automata of the flute player—the pipe and tabor player—and the masticating and digesting duck, had experienced the want of this species of ocular instruction, and even at an advanced age began to make a collection of machines, models, and philosophical instruments, which he placed in the Hôtel de Mortagne. At his death in 1782 he bequeathed the whole of his machines to the Government, and this valuable collection became the nucleus of the present “Conservatory of Arts and Trades.” But although a love of the marvellous more than a love of science had induced Louis XVI. to take an interest in Vaucanson’s caoutchouc automaton—of a man with the whole of his physiological apparatus, yet it does not appear that either he or the nation placed a sufficient value on the extraordinary pieces of mechanism which Vaucanson had constructed. The two musical automata which we have mentioned, as might have been expected, were not acquired by the State and placed in the collection which it had received from their inventor; they were purchased by Professor Bayreuss of Helmstadt, to adorn the museum of another land, or perhaps to disappear, as they seem to have done, in the possession of their ignorant owner. The Government, however, set a proper value on the legacy of Vaucanson. They placed it under the

charge of a Comptroller-General, and issued an ordonnance, requiring that all machines and models which received a national reward, should be deposited in the collection. The Hôtel de Mortagne was subsequently purchased by the Government, and an annual sum voted for the maintenance of the collection. Before the commencement of the Revolution, above 300 new machines for cotton and carding, and for the manufacture of hosiery, ribbons, and lace, were added to the museum; but amid the destruction of monuments and works of art which characterized that barbarous event, the machinery for abridging labour was peculiarly exposed to the fury of the people. The Legislative Assembly, indeed, and the National Convention appointed commissioners to collect the scattered relics of science and of art which the Vandals had spared; but it was not till 1794 that a Commission of Arts, in which the Abbé Gregoire and M. Charles were the most active, contrived to save, often at the peril of their lives, upwards of 800 objects which were lodged in the Hôtel D'Aguillen, and which led to the present establishment of the "*Conservatoire des Arts et des Metiers*," founded by a decree drawn up by the Abbé Gregoire, and issued on the 19th Vendemiaire 1795. In 1799 the collection was transferred to the Abbey of St. Martin, where it received great additions, and was classified for the instruction of artificers and workmen. In 1806 M. de Champagny, the Minister of the Interior, founded a school for the industrial education of the children of workmen to be recommended by the mayors of towns and the prefects of departments. From 1810 to 1811 this school counted 300 students. "It furnished," as Colonel Lloyd observes, "sub-officers to the sappers and engineers,—young men for the offices of the Bureau of Fortifications and of St. Cyr, as well as a great number of overseers of works, and superintendents of workshops and manufactories." About this time Napoleon had offered a million of francs for prizes in the manufacture of cotton and carding machinery, and in furtherance of these views there was established in 1810 a school for instruction in the spinning of cotton and wool. Under such influences the march of industrial instruction was rapid and regular. The lectures, however, became too scientific, but this retrograde step, as soon as it was recognised, led in 1842 to the establishment of a commission under Baron Thenard, which not only remedied the evil, but raised the institution to its present improved and flourishing state. In 1846, the sum of 1,000,000 francs was voted for additions to the collection, and in 1850 it possessed 4500 articles representing 7000 machines, together with a great number of machines themselves, chemical apparatus, philosophical instruments, and tools.

In 1850 the sum of £6250 was voted for the service of the *Conservatoire*, and the following was the system of instruction given in two theatres on different days of the week :—

Sunday.	Charles Dupin.	Geometry applied to the Arts and Statics.
	Olivier.	Descriptive Geometry—applied and theoretical.
	Morin.	Practical Mechanics, Steam Engine.
	Peligot. Pouillet.	Chemistry applied to the Arts. Physics applied to the Arts and Machines.
Monday.	Olivier.	Descriptive Geometry.
Tuesday.	Payen.	Chemistry applied to the Arts.
	Moll.	Agriculture.
	Blanqui.	Industrial Economy.
Wednesday.	Wolowski.	Industrial Legislation.
	Pouillet.	Physics.
Thursday.	Ebelmen.	Ceramic Arts and Manufactures.
	Morin.	Mechanics.
	Peligot.	Chemistry, Metallurgy, Dyeing, Colours, &c.
Friday.	Moll.	Agriculture, Drainage, Irrigation, and Manure.
	Blanqui.	Industrial Economy.
	Wolowski.	Industrial Legislation.
Saturday.	Payen.	Chemistry, Textile substances, and Economic Manufactures.
During the Week.	Martelet.	Geometry.
	Armengaud.	Designing of Machines.
	De Wailly.	Agriculture.
	Le Compté.	Industrial Design.

In the excellent institution which we have now described, industrial education was given *gratis* to mechanics, and to the poorer classes of students; and zealous and intelligent workmen thus educated were intrusted with the direction of many manufacturing establishments. The progress of the arts in England and other countries, rendered necessary a more extensive system of industrial education for the middle classes in France; and with this view the *Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures* was established in 1829, under the most eminent and experienced professors, for the purpose of educating the pupils as engineers, directors of manufactories, managers of public works of all descriptions, and professors of the applied sciences. Though at first a private establishment, it was placed under the surveillance of the Minister of Public Instruction, and in 1838 under the

Minister of Commerce and Agriculture, who received a public grant to defray the expense of sending up students to it from the State. In 1842 nineteen of the "Conseils Généraux," in different departments of France, voted funds to send up twenty-three young men from their towns, and the Minister had made provision for forty students whose families were entitled to the gratitude of the nation.

We have now before us the pamphlet, No. 9 of our list, containing ample and interesting details respecting the constitution of this important establishment, and as it must, to a very considerable extent, be a pattern for all similar institutions, we shall endeavour to give an abstract of its contents. The Central School of Arts and Manufactures occupies the "Hôtel de Juigné, Rue de Thorigny, au Marais." The authority of the school is vested in a Director, and there is also a director of studies, assisted by a council of *nine* professors. Besides these professors there are other *six* who are not members of council, together with five assistant professors. In addition to these functionaries two teachers give instruction on Special Technology, (textile manufactures, carding, sawing, pottery, &c.,) other two superintend the mechanical works, and other three the department of design. There are also twelve *répétiteurs* or tutors of high character, three *préparateurs* for the experimental courses of chemistry and physics, *three* officers for the "Service d'Administration," *two* librarians, and *four* inspectors, who have the surveillance of the pupils, and are charged with the maintenance of discipline. The following are the general statutes:—

1. *The object of the School.*—The central school is destined specially to form civil engineers, directors of workshops, superintendents of manufactories,—to foster the industry of men capable of bringing into the direction of these establishments and of great public works, the lights furnished by the physical and mathematical sciences, not only when studied in their more important and general doctrines, but above all when considered in reference to their practical application.

2. *The Institution of the School.*—The council of studies chooses the professors and officers, and admits or rejects candidates according to the result of their examination. The director who lives in the college has the charge of the correspondence and the general administration, and in the interval between the monthly sittings of the council, there is a "council of order," consisting of the director and at least one professor. The Government candidates must be between the age of 18 and 21, while private students, who may be foreigners acquainted with the French language, are admitted at any age above 16. The students live in private lodging-houses, and wear no uniform; they breakfast, however, in the establishment. The fee for

each student is 775 francs, (£32,) or £36, including the materials used at the school.

3. *Instruction.*—The course of instruction is limited to *three* years. It includes lectures, daily examinations, drawing and graphic exercises, chemical manipulations, working in stone and wood, physics or natural philosophy, mechanics, details in the construction of buildings and other works, problems for solution, plans for industrial constructions, and partial and general examinations. All the courses are obligatory for *three* years; but at the middle of the second year, the graphic studies, and the manipulations, and plans (projects) are divided into two series, the one of a general nature, and the other relative to the special profession for which the student is to be prepared. These specialties are *four* in number, viz., the specialty of *Mechanicians*, including, 1. The construction and establishment of machines and the mechanical arts; 2. The specialty of *Constructors*, including the erection of buildings, public works, and the physical arts,—bridges, canals, roads, railways, civil and industrial architecture, heating, lighting, and the salubrity of towns and great establishments; 3. The specialty of *Metallurgists*, including the working of mines and metallurgy; and 4thly, The specialty of *Chemists*, including *mineral* chemistry, with pottery, porcelain and glass making, chemical products in general, and the arts of assaying and refining the precious metals, organic and agricultural chemistry, dyeing, distilling, bleaching, brewing, tanning, sugar making, &c., &c.

At the end of the first six months of the second year, the student is obliged to decide to which of these special studies his future education is to be directed.

The annual course commences on the 10th of November for the *first* year, and on the 2d of March for the *second* and *third* years, and it terminates during the month of July. The general examination takes place at the end of each course, and they all terminate from the 10th to the 20th of August, when the vacation begins.

4. *The Diplomas and Certificates of Merit.* The *diploma* of civil engineer is given only to those who have passed the prescribed trials during the three years of the school; and *certificates of capacity* are granted to those who have passed only a certain number of the prescribed trials. The trials are written and oral. The students are allowed *thirty-five* days for executing their designs in the interior of the school, and drawing the memoir in reference to them; and they are afterwards examined orally on their designs, which they are obliged publicly to explain and defend in presence of a jury of at least five professors. Those only who hold diplomas, or certificates of capacity, are recognised as having been students of the school,

(*anciens élèves*,) and the professors are prohibited from giving to the other pupils any kind of special certificate.

5. *Mode of Admission of the Pupils.* No pupils can be admitted without passing two examinations—one written and another oral, in arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and drawing. Preference is given to natives of France that have passed their trials, whose literary education fits them for the composition of memoirs and reports; foreign students being required only to have such a knowledge of French as will enable them to follow the lecturer.

The following is a list of the Professors who teach the different branches of knowledge in the school during the course of three years:—

FIRST YEAR.

- M. OLIVIER.—*Descriptive Geometry*.—Theory of Application; Perspective Drawing and Shadows; Stone-cutting and Carpentry.
- M. MARTELET.—1, *Analytical Geometry*, and 2, *General Mechanics*.—Theory of the Motion and Equilibrium of a Material Point; Media of a System of Material Points; Statics of Solid Bodies.
- M. WALTER DE SAINTANGE and M. FAURE.—*Construction of Machines*.—Elements of Machinery.
- M. MASSON.—*General Physics*.—Hydrostatics; Hydrodynamics; Heat, Magnetism; Radial Electricity; Electro-dynamics; and Electro-magnetics; Molecular Action; Acoustics, Optics; and the Construction and Use of all kinds of Philosophical and Physical Instruments.
- M. DUMAS and M. CAHOURS.—*General Chemistry*.—Mineral and Organic.
- M. RIGOUT.—*Chemical Manipulation*.
- M. DOYERE.—*Hygienic Science and Natural History applied to Industry*.—Physiology and Medicine in reference to Public Health and the Health of Workmen; Natural History of the Animal and Vegetable Kingdom.

In the first year, Drawing and Design are taught in all their branches; and during the vacation the pupils execute plans and elevations of buildings and machines, which they are obliged to present on their return to school.

SECOND YEAR.

- M. OLIVIER.—*Descriptive Geometry*, with Modelling in Plaster for Stone Cutting.
- M. PECLET.—*Industrial Physics*.—Different kinds of Fuel and their heating powers; Chimneys of Factories and Houses; Furnaces; Conductibility; Vaporisation; Distillation; Evaporation; Heating and Cooling of Bodies; Heating, Ventilation, and Sanitary Arrangements for Houses.

The students of the second year construct with bricks or plaster, on a scale of one-fourth, chimneys, furnaces, &c.; and during the vacation they visit factories and workshops, of which they make drawings and write descriptions, to be presented on their return to college.

SECOND AND THIRD YEAR.

The following courses are divided into two sections, marked A and B, each of which is given every two years to the united pupils of the second and third year.

- M. BELANGER.**—*Applied Mechanics.*—Section A, Statics; Section B, Hydrostatics and Hydraulics.
- M. WALTER DE SAINTANGE.**—*Construction and Establishment of Machines.*—Section taught every year.—The different Elements of Machinery. Section A, Properties of Materials; Theory of their Resistance; Modes of Executing Machines and putting them together. Section B, General Principles on the Establishment and Construction of Machines.
- M. PELIGOT.**—*Analytical Chemistry.*—Section A, General Method of Analysis; Gases; Acids; Alloys and Minerals. Section B, Use of Re-agents and Blowpipe, Analysis of Principal Organic Products.
- M. PAYEN.**—*Industrial Chemistry.*—Section A, Minerals; and, Section B, Organic and Agricultural Chemistry.
- M. MARY.**—*Architecture and Public Works.*—Section A, Public Works; Bridges; Inland and River Navigation. Section B, Architecture, Public and Private; Carpentry; Roofing; Sawing; Valuation of Works; Conducting of Water.
- M. ANÉDÉE BURAT.**—*Geognosy and Working of Mines.*—Section A, Physical Geography; Mineralogy and Geognosy. Section B, Working, Draining, and Ventilating of Mines.
- M. FERRY.**—*Metallurgy of Iron.*—Section A, Manufacture of Iron and Steel; of Zinc and Copper. Section B, High Furnaces and Foundries; Metallurgy of Tin, Lead, and Silver.
- M. FERRY.**—Year A.—Ropemaking; Sawing of Wood and Stone.
Year B.—Mill-work and Oil-making.
- M. ALCAN.**—Year A.—Preparation of Textile Materials—Cotton, Wool, Lint, Hemp.
Year B.—Weaving—Felting and Fulling.
- M. SALVETAT.***—Year B.—Manufacture of Pottery and Porcelain; Slates; Bricks and Crucibles.

SPECIAL COURSES OF THE THIRD YEAR.

M. THOMAS.—*Steam Engine.*—Steam Navigation.

M. PERDONNET.—*Railways.*—Locomotive Powers and Machines, &c.

* The subjects taught by these three Professors constitute *Technology*.

The pamphlet from which we have abstracted, in an abridged form, the preceding details, contains a list, occupying *ten* pages, of all the pupils who have left the school with a diploma and a certificate of capacity, and of the situations which they now fill, or have formerly filled, together with the principal works which they have executed—the letter D being affixed to the names of those who received a diploma, and C of those who have merited only a certificate of capacity. The table is one of the most interesting documents in the statistics of education with which we are acquainted. It exhibits the true practical working of the institution from which it is derived; and were we furnished with such a table of the results of our own educational system, we should be able to appreciate better the character and value of the colleges, and schools, and private academies, from which our youth are ushered into the social world. We cannot, of course, in our limited space, give a translation of this remarkable document, but we shall attempt to give a brief analysis of it, without the hope of indicating its true value.*

	No. of Students.	Employed.
AGRICULTURE,	<i>French</i> , 10, <i>Poles</i> , 2, . . .	7 in France; 1 in Turkey; 1 in Algeria; 1 in Poland; 1 in Galicia; 1 in Louisiana.
ARCHITECTURE BUILDINGS, AND CANALS,	<i>French</i> , 32; <i>Poles</i> , 2, . .	30 in France, holding some of the highest scientific appointments in the State; 1 in Wallachia; 1 in Algeria; 1 in Germany; 1 in Switzerland.
RAILWAYS,	<i>French</i> , 81, <i>German</i> , 2, <i>English</i> , 1, <i>Poles</i> , 4, . . .	85 in France, with high appointments in Railways, Telegraphs, &c.; 1 in Wurtemberg; 1 in England; 1 in Belgium; 1 in Germany; 1 in Switzerland; 1 in United States.
INDUSTRIAL AND SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTORS,	<i>French</i> , 29, <i>Spaniards</i> , 2; <i>Italians</i> , 1; <i>Swiss</i> , 1; <i>Rio Janeiro</i> , 1; <i>Greeks</i> , 1; <i>Poles</i> , 1,	29 in France; 2 in Spain; 2 in Austria and Russia; 1 in Switzerland; 1 in Greece; 1 in Cracow.
SPINNING, WEAVING, CALICO PRINTING,	<i>French</i> , 16; <i>Swiss</i> , 3; <i>Germans</i> , 1; <i>Spaniards</i> , 2; <i>Swedes</i> , 1,	20 in France; 4 Switzerland; 6 Germany; 2 Spain; 1 Sweden.
PUBLIC FUNCTIONARIES,	<i>French</i> , 17; <i>Spaniards</i> , 2, various <i>Foreigners</i> , 20,	18 in France; 3 Brazil; 2 Spain; 16 in various parts of the Old and New World.
INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY, CERAMICS, GLASS WORKS, TANNERIES, SUGAR AND GAS WORKS,	<i>French</i> , 37; <i>Foreigners</i> , 6,	31 in France; 1 Brazil; 1 Isle of Bourbon; 1 America; 9 in Europe.
CIVIL ENGINEERS,	<i>French</i> , 31; <i>Americans</i> , 2; <i>Egyptians</i> , 1; <i>Cubans</i> , 1; <i>Belgians</i> , 2, <i>Others</i> , 4,	31 in France; 4 Germany; 3 Belgium; 2 Holland; 2 Egypt; 1 Rio; 1 Spain.
MECHANICS AND MACHINES,	<i>French</i> , 21; <i>United States</i> , 2; <i>Russian Poles</i> , 2,	17 in France; 2 England; 1 America; 1 Belgium; 4 Elsewhere.
METALLURGY, MINING, FORGES,	<i>French and Foreigners</i> , 69,	40 in France; 9 Germany; 4 Belgium; 3 Algeria; 4 Prussia; 2 Spain; 1 Ireland; 6 Others.
PAPERMAKING, PLATING, COMMERCE, SALT WORKS,	<i>French</i> , 20,	20 in France.

* The following is a specimen of the complete list:—
Fonctions Publiques. ALPHONSO (D) Director of the Conservatory of Arts and Trades at Madrid.
Industrie Diverses. CHARTRAND (C) Civil Engineer in the Isle of Cuba.

Besides these two great central institutions, there are in France three very large provincial Colleges of Arts and Trades, established for the education of the industrial classes. The oldest of these was founded at Chalons-sur-Mer, by the Duke de Rochefoucault. Another is placed at Angers, and a third at Aix. They are all Government establishments, maintained by an annual grant of 300,000 francs, or £12,500 for each. The scholars, 250 in number, and in three divisions, are lodged, educated, and maintained in the college during a term of three years,—five hours in the day being devoted to study, and seven to the various workshops. When their course is completed, they receive their certificates of capacity after a severe examination; and from these colleges, all the Government establishments, and many others, are supplied with engineers, or assistant engineers, highly qualified for the offices which they fill.

If we examine the preceding table, we shall find that in 1850 436 students educated at the central school, were known to hold important situations in France, and 118 in other parts of the world. The countries adjoining France, and particularly Belgium, where the French language is spoken, have experienced the advantage of these institutions, and have derived from France their most accomplished scientific manufacturers. The Belgian Government, thus cognizant of the advantages of such a system of practical education, have resolved to establish an Industrial College at Antwerp, and probably another at Brussels, and likewise to give a more practical character to their system of primary education. In the small states of Germany, too, where classical studies predominated, almost to the exclusion of practical knowledge, a system of scientific education has been introduced, which has been attended with the happiest effects, and contributed to the rapid development of their manufacturing industry.

Such was the state of Industrial Education in France and other parts of the Continent previous to the Exhibition of 1851. We have already seen what was its condition in England. A Chair of Chemistry and of Physics in each of the Universities of the empire, and a few insulated institutions, were the Pierian springs for refreshing the industrial genius of a nation whose manufactures were about to be rivalled under the advancing intelligence and national encouragement of foreign countries. This great truth, which had been long felt and deplored by sagacious individuals, displayed itself to the public eye, and pressed itself upon the public notice, during the year of the Exhibition. Dr. Lyon Playfair, whose position as the Commissioner appointed to aid the Juries, enabled him to form a correct and unbiassed judgment, has nobly thrown off the official reserve

which that position imposed upon him, and established beyond a doubt the unpopular truth, that the Sciences have been long declining in England, while they have been rapidly advancing in every other country; and that the industrial arts of foreign lands, following the fortunes of science, have been deriving from its advancement a vitality and power, which it will require all the energy of the philosopher, the manufacturer, and the Government, to equal or surpass. Dr. Playfair's lecture on the Necessity of Industrial Instruction, and of a high state of abstract science as its only sure foundation, reminds us of the eloquent and powerful appeals which, nearly a quarter of a century ago, were made by Mr. Babbage and his friends to the Government of the day.* National vanity was wounded by the truth, and second-rate gladiators rushed into the arena to challenge the writers who had thus maligned the philosophy and the philosophers of their country. It was, doubtless, mortifying to hear from the mouth of Sir John Herschell, "that whole branches of continental discovery were unstudied in England, and almost unknown by name"—that "we were fast dropping behind"—that "in mathematics we had long since drawn the rein, and given over a hopeless race"—that "in chemistry the case was not much better,"—and that "there were, indeed, few sciences which would not furnish matter for similar remark." Sir Humphrey Davy in his latter days assured us, "that there were very few persons in England who pursued science with true dignity;" and that it is by science alone that our manufacturing wealth must be preserved and extended; and Mr. Babbage emphatically declared, "that mathematics, and with it the highest departments of physical science, have gradually declined since the days of Newton."

More than a quarter of a century has passed away since English Science was thus denounced by competent authorities: let us now see how authorities equally high, and equally disinterested, speak of its condition in the present day. Dr. Playfair assumes the unpalatable truth as an axiom. He tells us that "the means of advancing science in this country are wanting"—that "its professors and cultivators require position and patronage"—that "*Science languishes in England, and that her capital has to import it from other lands.*" The influence of such a state of things on our industry and industrial institutions is too palpable to escape the notice of Dr. Playfair: He regards the man of science—"the discoverer of abstract laws, as the real benefactor to his kind." He pronounces "abstract and not practical science to be the life and soul of industry," and its cultivators the horses

* See this Journal, Vol. xiv. No. xxvii. pp. 235-287.

of the *chariot* of industry, while "the manufacturers are but the harness by which the motion is communicated to the chariot." But he asks in continuation, "if the chariot is drawn by the horses or by the harness? Truth to say, *in this country of ours, and mark you well, in no other country in Europe, we honour the harness, but neglect the horses.* It is the harness that is gilt; the hard-working horses too often receive but meagre fare. Now, in all this I tell you *a living truth*, one far more connected with the actual material progress of our nation than you may be aware of."

But while Dr. Playfair ascribes the decline of science to the fact that the honours of the State "are chiefly conferred on those who are useful in their own time and generation," and withheld from men who discover truths eternal and sublime, and which may even have a practical application in another age; he points out other causes equally fatal to its progress in the system of education which prevails in the Universities and Academies of the empire. He considers it "truly lamentable that Oxford and Cambridge so little encourage the sciences," and he declares that the scientific instruction in the Scotch and Irish Colleges, and in University and King's College, London, "terminates just where the Industrial Colleges on the Continent begin." In the beautiful language of Eothen, quoted by Dr. Playfair, the aspirations of our youth towards science "are quenched by freezing drenches of scholastic lore." "You feel so keenly the delights of early knowledge, . . . you learn the ways of the planets, and transcend their narrow limits, and ask for the end of space; you vex the electric cylinder till it yields you for your toy to play with that subtle fire in which our earth was forged. . . . What more will you ever learn? Yet the dismal change is ordained; and then thin meagre Latin—(the same for everybody)—with small shreds and patches of Greek, is thrown, like a pauper's pall, over all your early lore;—instead of sweet knowledge, vile, monkish, doggerel grammars, and graduses, dictionaries, and lexicons, and horrible odds and ends of dead languages, are given you for your portion: and down you fall from Roman story to a three-inch scrap of *Scriptores Romani*, from Greek poetry down to the cold rations of *Poetæ Græci*, cut up by commentators, and served out by schoolmasters." "Is this horrible quenching," adds Dr. Playfair, "of all our youthful innate love of God's truth, the education for the youth of a nation depending for its progress for their development? How is it possible that dead literature can be the parent of living science and of active industry?"

Similar views respecting the discouragement of science in England have been expressed by Mr. Glaisher of the Greenwich Observatory, in his excellent Lecture on Philosophical Instru-

ments and Processes. "As an Englishman," he says, "anxious for the maintenance of his country's prosperity, I cannot forbear observing that lavish as is the repayment of science for its culture, inadequate, in this country, at all times, has been the repayment permitted to its followers. The lot of the scientific man has been heretofore most frequently to expend years of study, experiment, and research, his means, possibly his health: For what return? To find himself unrecognised, unheeded, and each year a poorer man than he was the year before, to find that for want of power, through the lack of means for its employment, he thus served to lay a foundation for the after use of countries more liberal and more discerning, and so to possess another with ease of the gift, to place which at the disposal of his country he has sacrificed the best years of his life. . . . The scientific man being so frequently exposed to a life of unremunerated labour, urges me to express a hope that at no distant time the pursuit of science in England may constitute a distinct profession, open to the preferments and advantages of other professions. . . . I have permitted myself to speak thus freely, from a conviction that the dawn of a brighter day for science is fast approaching. The erection of the Exhibition, and the respect shewn to mind by entrusting to its charge the management and direction of its multitudinous details, and the constituting it sole judge of the respective excellencies of its contents; the high interest that science, in its highest applications and development of power, commanded from its illustrious designer, leads to the reasonable expectation that more encouragement will be held out to those who are capable of adding to the number of truths on which such applications are founded."

Such are the opinions entertained and avowed by competent and disinterested judges, respecting the decline of English science;—the necessity of its being endowed and honoured by the State as the only true foundation of the industrial arts;—and the probability that the Exhibition will, through the aid of Prince Albert, be the means of effecting a complete revolution in our educational, scientific, and industrial institutions. In order, therefore, to enable our readers to judge of the reasonableness of these views, and of the necessity of such essential changes to the development and progress of our manufacturing industry, we shall proceed to point out the great truths which we have learned from the Exhibition, in reference to the state of science and the industrial arts in our own and other countries;—to explain the changes which are required in our existing schools, academies, and universities, and to indicate the general nature and character of the new establishments for industrial instruction, and of the new institution for advancing those abstract

sciences without the light of which both art and industry would perish.

In order to learn the lessons taught us by the Exhibition, we must enter into some statistical details respecting its character and results; and though some of these may have been partially given in a former Article,* while others may be regarded as more interesting from their curiosity than from their application to our argument, we have no doubt that they will be both gratifying and instructive to those who have not access to the sources of information from which we derive them.

We have already stated in a former Article, that the Exhibition building was 1848 feet long, 408 feet wide, and 108 feet high in the semicylindrical transept, 64 feet high in the nave, and 24 feet in the parts without galleries. The contract price of the building was £79,800, but owing to an increase in the extent of the building for extra offices, refreshment rooms, and the enclosure of a separate area for the machinery department, the total expense of the Crystal Palace was £107,780, 7s. 6d. Even this sum, however, owing to causes over which the contractors had no control, was not adequate to cover all expenses, and to remunerate the contractors for their services. An additional sum, therefore, of £35,000 was paid to them, making the total expense of the Crystal Palace, not including the fittings, to be £142,780, 7s. 6d.

The arrangements made by the Commissioners for the protection of the property of exhibitors, and of the persons of the visitors, were of the most admirable kind. The expense incurred for the external police was £5,043, 19s. 4d., and for the internal £14,603, 18s. 5d., making in all £19,647, 17s. 9d.; but as the Commissioners were desirous of "marking their sense of the admirable conduct of the police," they awarded a sum of £2710, to be distributed among them in gratuities, so that the total expense of the police amounted to £22,337, 17s. 9d. The largest number of police employed inside the building at any one time was on the 26th and 27th May, (the first shilling days,) viz.:—8 inspectors, 38 serjeants, and 609 constables on duty; the average number, however, subsequently varied from 350 to 400. In addition to police constables, 26 provincial and 36 foreign police, together with 26 interpreters, were employed. It is a curious fact that there was "almost an entire absence of crime connected with the Exhibition," and that "although the number of visits paid to it exceeded *six millions*, not more than 21 persons were apprehended in the building on any charge whatever!"

* See this Journal, Vol. xv., or No. xxx., pp. 529-568.

With the addition of the police expenses, the necessary outlay on the part of the Royal Commission amounts to £165,132, 5s.; and when we recollect the refusal of the Government to give any pecuniary aid, and the numerous prophecies that the Exhibition would be a failure, we cannot too highly applaud the liberality and public spirit by which the Commissioners were guided in hazarding so enormous an expenditure. If the parties liable for this large sum ever had any fear, which we believe they had not, that it would not be balanced by the receipts from the visitors of the Crystal Palace, that fear must have been removed on the very first day of its opening, when those who had been hostile to the Exhibition, as well as those who had been doubtful of its success, were compelled to admire and to applaud. The total number of visitors who entered the Palace was 6,039,195, or upwards of *six millions*.

		Average per Day.	
During 141 days,	773,766 entered with season tickets,	.	5,473
" 2 "	1042 paid £1,	521
" 28 "	245,389 paid 5s.,	8,763
" 30 "	579,519 paid 2s. 6d.,	. : . . .	19,319
" 80 "	4,139,419 paid 1s.,	45,493

It is not easy to ascertain how many visitors to the Crystal Palace came from foreign countries, but it appears from the Alien lists, that the excess of foreigners who arrived in England between the 1st of April and the 30th September 1851, over those who arrived in the year 1850 during the same period, was 42,913, a number much less than had been anticipated.

The number of visitors during the week after the first four weeks (during which it varied from 58,042 to 204,060) fluctuated between 250,000 and 300,000: In the last week but one it amounted to 323,948; and in the last week the number was 518,277. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 6, 7, 8, when the admission was 1s., the numbers were, 107,815, 109,915, and 109,760. The average number of visitors each day was 42,831. The greatest number of persons in the building at one time was 93,224, on the 7th October, when the whole number during the day was 109,915. It is interesting to know that the total number of schools whose scholars visited the Exhibition was 493, and the number of scholars, 35,540. In connexion with the number of persons who visited the Exhibition, the following document, exhibiting the number who visited the public and private buildings in and near London in the years 1850 and 1851, possesses peculiar interest:—

536 *Prince Albert's Industrial College of Arts and Manufactures.*

	1850.	1851.
Windsor Castle,	31,228,	129,400.
St. Paul's—The Floor,	No account,	{ From 600 to 6000 per hour.
„ The Galleries, small fee paid,	110,250.
Westminster Abbey,	6000 per day.
British Museum,	720,643,	2,230,242.
National and Vernon Galleries, . . .	Free	519,745,
Hampton Court Palace,	admission.	208,374,
Kew Botanic Gardens,	163,828,	184,248.
Kew Pleasure Gardens,	35,218,	127,517.
Armoury at the Tower,	Admission	33,313,
Crown Jewels at the Tower,	by regulated	32,888,
Greenwich Hospital,	Fees.*	66,054,
Woolwich Arsenal,	17,211,	100,104.
Woolwich Dockyard,	10,744,	165,421.
Deptford Dockyard,	3,313,	4,465.
Dulwich Gallery,	13,000,	19,000.
Sir J. Soane's Museum,	3,251,	7,357.
United Service Museum,	33,733,	36,470.
East India Company's Museum, . . .	18,620,	37,490.
London Missionary Museum,	No acct.,	About tenfold.
City Museum,	2680 parties.
St. Stephen's Walbrook,	Not open,	137,500.
Temple Church and Middle Temple Hall,	450 per day.
Northumberland House,	240,000.
Sion House,	110,000.
Lord Ellesmere's Gallery, Bridgewater House,	80,000.
Lord Ward's Collection,	20,000.

The noble conduct of the Duke of Northumberland, in opening his magnificent town-house, and also his house and splendid gardens and conservatories at Sion, was well rewarded by the excellent conduct of the 240,000 persons that had the freest access to them by ticket during the Exhibition. About 7000 were admitted in one day to Northumberland House, and “no damage whatever was done to the furniture, or to the numerous articles of vertu and china on the various tables and cabinets in the state apartments; and at Sion not a flower was taken, nor a shrub injured!” Lord Ellesmere and Lord Ward speak with equal gratification of the conduct of those who visited their fine collections.

From the great number of visitors who crowded the Crystal Palace, our readers will have anticipated the fact that a very large sum of money has been realized. The following is an analysis of the receipts and the expenditure up to the 29th February 1852 :—

* To all the other buildings there was free admission by tickets easily procurable.

RECEIPTS.			
Subscriptions,	.	.	£67,896 12 9
Catalogue Contract,	.	.	3,200 0 0
Refreshment Contract,	.	.	5,500 0 0
Season Tickets,	.	.	67,514 1 0
Receipts at the doors,	.	.	356,278 3 7
Receipts from Retiring Rooms,	.	.	4,580 3 8
Interest and Premium on Exchequer Bills,	.	.	897 17 4
Miscellaneous Receipts,	.	.	233 8 7
			<hr/>
			£506,100 6 11

PAYMENTS.			
Personal Services,	.	.	£67,309 11 7
Extra Clerks from Law Stationers,	.	.	735 4 10
Metropolitan Police,	.	.	22,357 17 9
Travelling Expenses and Expenses of Committee,	.	.	1,220 12 4
General Office Expenses,	.	.	8,869 1 11
Building and Fittings,	.	.	169,998 15 2
General Maintenance of Exhibition,	.	.	4,877 19 7
Jury Department,	.	.	6,916 10 8
Law Expenses, Stamps, &c.,	.	.	2,106 7 1
Award to Messrs. Mundays,	.	.	5,707 1 4
Interest on do., and other Interests, Contingencies,* &c.,	.	.	2,695 9 0

Total Expenditure,	.	.	£292,794 11 3
Total Receipts,	.	.	506,100 6 11

Exhibition Fund in the hands of the Committee, £213,305 15 8

The First Report of the Commissioners, from which we have abstracted these interesting details, contains a great number of curious facts, which, had we space, we would willingly transfer to our pages. The average expenditure of each class of visitors on refreshments (the receipts for which were £74,349, 15s. 3d.) was—

Visitors at 5s. and upwards, 4s. 4d. per head.

„ 2s. 6d. „ 4s. 8d.
 „ 1s. „ 2s. 4d., the general average being about 3s.

The following was the average amount expended by each visitor, including his entrance fee, catalogues, refreshments, and waiting rooms :—

Entrance fee,	£1	0	0	.	£1	0	7.83
„	„	0	5	0	.	0	5 5.75
„	„	0	2	6	.	0	3. 0.09
„	„	0	1	0	.	0	1 3.03

* Among the expenses incurred, we find a loss on light gold, £218; on defaced and foreign coin, £232; on spurious coin, £90; and on lost coats and umbrellas, £7, 3s. 6d.

The most interesting portion of the Commissioners' First Report relates to the contents of the Exhibition, the value of the articles exhibited, the number of persons that exhibited them, and the rewards conferred by the Juries. The following table shews the nature and value of the different articles contributed by the United Kingdom :—

BY THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Group A—Raw Materials.—

Class I. Mining and Mineral Products, . . .	£21,623	12	10
II. Chemical and Pharmaceutical do., . . .	3,279	16	4
III. Substances for Food, . . .	3,565	4	3
IV. Vegetable and Animal Substances for the Arts,	3,974	15	10

Group B—Machinery.—

V. Machines for direct use, Carriages, &c., . . .	108,115	5	11
VI. Manufacturing Machines and Tools . . .	44,976	6	10
VII. Civil Engineering and Architectural Ar- ticles,	20,123	18	11
VIII. Naval Architecture and Military Engi- neering,	30,079	4	5
IX. Agricultural and Horticultural Machines and Implements,	13,426	8	8
X. Philosophical, Musical, Horological, and Surgical Instruments,	63,976	12	7

Group C—Textile Fabrics.—

XI. Cotton Manufactures,	1,828	9	9
XV. & XII. Woollen and Mixed Fabrics, . . .	24,433	5	0
XIII. Silk and Velvet,	5,427	15	10
XIV. Manufactures from Flax and Hemp, . . .	5,000	9	0
XVI. Leather, Saddlery, Harness, Skins, Furs, .	9,764	6	6
XVII. Paper, Stationery, Printing, and Book- binding,	7,242	0	2
XVIII. Specimens of Printing and Dyeing, . .	4,239	8	2
XIX. Tapestry, Carpets, Lace, Embroidery, .	21,128	14	1
XX. Clothing for personal use,	6,408	11	2

*Group D—Metallic, Vitreous, and Ceramic
Manufactures.—*

XXI. Cutlery and Edge Tools,	1,287	0	10
XXII. Iron and General Hardware,	57,669	11	3
XXIII. Precious Metals, Jewellery, Articles of Vertu,	340,481	17	7
XXIV. Glass,	21,126	1	11
XXV. Pottery—China, Porcelain,	10,939	7	3

Carry forward, £833,118 5 1

Group E—Miscellaneous Manufactures.—

	Brought forward, £833,118	5	1
XXVI. Furniture, articles in Papier Maché, Japan,	45,925	7	11
XXVII. Mineral Manufactures, Marbles, Por- phyries, &c.,	8,628	2	1
XXVIII. Animal and Vegetable manufactures,	4,251	18	7
XXIX. Miscellaneous, and Small Wares,	15,364	8	10

Group F—Fine Arts.—

XXX. Sculpture, Models and Plastic Art,	55,413	8	6
---	--------	---	---

Belonging to Different Classes.—

Transept,	12,589	0	0
Main Avenue,	40,113	0	0
Outside,	3,425	13	9
Articles exhibited by Her Majesty and Prince Albert,	12,778	0	0
<i>Koh-i-noor Diamond, not valued.</i>			

TOTAL of the United Kingdom, £1,031,607 4 9

BY THE COLONIES.

From India,	£70,000	0	0
„ Canada,	2,378	17	7
„ Van Diemen's Land,	1,500	0	0
„ Jersey and Guernsey,	1,456	5	2
„ Nova Scotia,	1,350	0	0
„ Malta,	1,133	8	10
„ Cape of Good Hope,	367	17	10
„ Western Africa,	323	0	0
„ British Guiana,	150	0	9
„ New South Wales,	132	15	9
„ Bahama Islands,	122	19	0
„ Ionian Islands,	118	4	0
„ Trinidad,	100	0	0
„ Ceylon,	95	0	0
„ Mauritius,	84	10	0
„ New Zealand,	80	0	0
„ Barbadoes,	63	0	0
„ Other fourteen localities,	176	12	6

TOTAL from the Colonies, £79,901 15 0

BY FOREIGN STATES.

From France,	294,683	11	1
„ Austria,	71,444	18	2

Carry forward, £366,128 9 3

	Brought forward, £366,128	9	3
From Belgium,	60,000	0	0
„ Russia,	58,889	14	5
„ Prussia,	41,314	15	0
„ United States,	23,835	0	0
„ Bavaria, and other six Zollverein States,	19,299	15	0
„ Rome,	17,475	0	0
„ Spain,	10,000	0	0
„ Tuscany,	10,000	0	0
„ Turkey,	9,500	0	0
„ Tunis,	8,988	8	0
„ Switzerland,	8,153	17	11
„ China,	6,367	10	0
„ Netherlands,	5,920	10	0
„ Sardinia,	5,500	0	0
„ Portugal, and Madeira,	5,000	0	0
„ Hanse Towns and North Germany,	4,457	10	0
„ Sweden and Norway,	3,941	17	0
„ Denmark,	2,000	0	0
„ Chili,	1,000	0	0
„ Egypt, Greece, Persia, Mexico, New Granada, Brazil, Society Isles, St. Domingo,	2,649	0	0
TOTAL from Foreign Countries,	£670,420	11	7

SUMMARY.

United Kingdom,	£1,031,607	4	9
British Colonies,	79,901	15	0
Foreign Countries,	670,420	11	7
Total value of articles exhibited,	£1,791,929	11	4
To which if we add the Koh-i-noor,	250,000	11	4
We have,	£2,031,930	2	8

The Commissioners, including all the expenses of the building, have stated that the value of the Crystal Palace and its contents was fully TWO MILLIONS. Adding the Koh-i-noor at a low value, which ought to have been done, the value of the whole amounts to TWO AND A QUARTER MILLION.

From the articles exhibited, we must now pass to the exhibitors, and the rewards which they have received. The Commissioners have published a very curious table, occupying eight pages, shewing the number of exhibitors from each country to each of the thirty classes of articles, with the quantity of space, horizontal and vertical, which their articles occupied; but it is only the following general results which we can give:—

	No. of Exhibitors.	Space in Superficial Feet.	
		Horizontal.	Vertical.
United Kingdom, ..	6861	189,275	411,340
British Colonies, ...	520	17,784	18,974
Foreign Countries,	6556	131,655	222,832
Total,	13,937	338,714	653,143

On the same scale the Commissioners have published a list of the awards, given to exhibitors of every nation, and in every class. The following is the general result:—

	No. of Exhibitors.	Council Medals.	Prize Medals.	Honourable Mention.	Total Awards.
Group A.....	2474	22	552	675	1249
B.....	3022	88	516	163	767
C.....	3818	4	923	544	1471
D.....	1705	32	510	407	949
E.....	1801	14	371	249	634
F.....	930	4	82	85	171
	13,750	164	2954	2123	5241
Unclassified,.....	187	7	„	„	„
Total,.....	13,937	171	2954	2123	5241

After the Exhibition was closed, the medals were sent to the Commissioners from different foreign states, and we presume have been given to the exhibitors with some solemnity and form at public meetings held for the purpose. In France, where all such duties are performed so as to confer honour upon the promoters of science and industry, the medals were distributed by the President Louis Napoleon, and the decoration of the Legion of Honour conferred upon the most distinguished exhibitors. Within the last month, on the 27th June, the medals awarded to the Tuscan exhibitors, *thirty-two* in number, with 25 honourable mentions, were distributed at Florence in the Hall Dell' Buonomore, by M. Baldasseroni, minister of finance, commerce, and public works, having on his right hand the minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Bulwer. The Grand Duke had desired that the distribution of these honourable awards to the genius and talent of his subjects, should be conducted in as

* See the *Times* of July 7th, 1852.

solemn a manner as possible, *in order to create a new tie between the throne and industry.* In order still more to evince the value which he attached to the prosecution of the scientific and industrial arts, the Grand Duke has instituted an industrial decoration, consisting of medals of the first and second class, bearing on one side the head of himself, as the founder of the order, and on the other the words ALL' INDUSTRIA—*To Industry.*

Such is a general view of the Exhibition, and its immediate results. Time alone can shew us the happy influence which it has exercised upon individuals and nations, not merely in promoting feelings of mutual kindness and sympathy among races hitherto hostile or estranged, but in advancing throughout the civilized world, and in introducing among barbarous communities, those peaceful arts which alone can ensure the social and physical happiness of man.

The Prince to whose talents and moral courage we owe the Exhibition itself, was not likely to leave it to work out its results within the United Kingdom. It might have been expected indeed that the statesmen who contend for place, and desire reputation, would have seen in the advancement of abstract and industrial science the true elements of political power, and the pure sources of undying fame, as well as the highest objects of political duty; but excepting in one document, we have not observed even the remotest allusion to art, industry, and science, in the manifestoes of parties, or in the appeals of individual aspirants to power. The document to which we refer is the Royal speech at the prorogation of Parliament, in which Her Majesty pledges herself "to extend and improve the national education, to *develop and encourage industry, art, and science*, to elevate the moral and social condition, and thereby promote the welfare and happiness of the people." This is the first time that the word *Science* has, in the hearing of Parliament, been pronounced from the throne of England, and we trust it is an earnest that the Minister intends to co-operate with Her Majesty and the Prince in fulfilling the expectations which a sentiment so new and noble cannot fail to have roused.

The first step to embalm the memory, and perpetuate the results of the Exhibition, was to obtain and preserve descriptions with diagrams and representations, either pictorial or photographic, of its varied contents; but it was soon found that this was a very imperfect plan, and that it would be advisable, with the co-operation of the exhibitors, to collect actual specimens of the materials and fabrics themselves, and, when possible, the very instruments and models which were exhibited. In this way the collection would be a valuable means of

reference for commercial, scientific, and artistic purposes, and would enable a strictly philosophical classification of them to be made. The success of this plan has already far exceeded the expectations of the Commissioners; and in so liberal a spirit has the proposal been received by exhibitors, both native and foreign, that a foundation has already been laid for a "Trade Collection of the Imports and Exports of the World," where men of business may examine and practically test samples of the very articles in which they are trading. No fewer than 1020 British exhibitors have presented specimens of the articles exhibited, while 654 have presented drawings, and 685 have promised samples, &c. Of the colonial exhibitors 212 have presented specimens, while 803 foreign exhibitors have done the same. The collection, therefore, which has been temporarily deposited by permission of the Queen in Kensington Palace, has been roughly valued as follows:—

British,	£6563
Colonial,	452
Foreign,	1703
		<hr/>
		£8718

Our readers will now be prepared, by the preceding details, to see the necessity and appreciate the advantages of establishing in the metropolis a Great Industrial Institution, similar in character, though more comprehensive in its plan, to the "Central School of Arts and Manufactures" in Paris,—a University, in short, in which the sciences and the arts of industry will be taught and illustrated by a Museum containing all the raw materials employed in manufactures, and all the machines and instruments by which these materials are modified and combined. Such a plan will no doubt startle those ill-informed and presumptuous individuals who regard the arts and manufactures of England as having long ago reached the acme of perfection, and who consider the voluntary institutions already in existence as amply sufficient to keep them at the high level which they have already attained. To demand new establishments for the useful arts appears to such persons an acknowledgment of our inferiority to other nations; and to sustain them by national liberality is pronounced to be *un-English*, and inconsistent with the voluntary liberality of the people and the free action of our institutions. Does not the Exhibition, say they, prove the high condition of English art and the advanced state of her industry? What nation has surpassed us in machinery and tools? and in what part of the globe can we find superiors in the splendid fabrics with which British industry has adorned the Exhibition? But even if our arts and manufactures are entitled to so high a

distinction, may it not be possible to raise them still higher? May not foreign nations, with a better climate and cheaper labour, and more intellectual Governments, be rapidly gaining upon us in the race? and do they not already surpass us in many important departments both in the fine and the useful arts?

Dr. Playfair, in his admirable lecture on the results of the Exhibition, has had the moral courage to answer these questions in their broadest aspect, and to declare truths to which the presumptuous ear of England has been but little accustomed.

"All European nations, except England," says he, "have recognised the fact, *that industry must in future be supported not by a competition of local advantages, but by a competition of intellect.* Their thinking men have proclaimed it; their Governments have adopted it as a principle of State, and every town has now its schools in which are taught the scientific principles involved in manufactures; while each metropolis rejoices in an Industrial University, teaching how to use the alphabet of science in reading manufactures aright. Were there any effects observed in the Exhibition from this intellectual training of their industrial populations? The official reserve necessarily imposed upon me as the Commissioner appointed to aid the Queen need exist no longer, and from my personal conviction I answer, without qualification, in the affirmative. The result of the Exhibition was one that England may well be startled at. Wherever—and that implies almost every manufacture—science or art was involved as an element of progress, we saw, as an inevitable law, that the nation which most cultivated them was in the ascendant. Our manufacturers were justly astonished at seeing most of the foreign countries rapidly approaching and sometimes excelling us in manufactures our own by hereditary and traditional right. Though certainly very superior in our own common *cutlery*, we could not claim decided superiority in that applied to *surgical instruments*, and were beaten in some kinds of *edge tools*. Neither our *swords* nor our *guns* were left with an unquestioned victory. In our *plate glass*, my own opinion—and I am sure that of many others—is, that if we were not beaten by Belgium, we certainly were by France. In *flint glass*, our ancient *prestige* was left very doubtful; and the only important discoveries in this manufacture were not those shewn on the English side. Belgium, which has deprived us of much of our American trade in *woollen manufactures*, found herself approached by competitors hitherto almost unknown, for Russia had risen to eminence in this branch, and the German woollens did not shame their birthplace. In *silversmith work* we had introduced a large number of foreign workmen as modellers and designers;* but, nevertheless,

*It is a curious fact, that our Manchester calico printers give liberal salaries to foreign designers in France. In our glass works, too, foreign science has been purchased to assist in their management. In the potteries we have foreign managers and designers; and our diamond-setters, as well as our silversmiths, depend much on foreign talent in art, and foreign skill in execution. Dr. Playfair calls this a suicidal policy which must have a termination.

we met with worthy competitors. In *calico printing* and *paper staining*, our designs looked wonderfully French; whilst ours, though generally as brilliant in themselves, did not appear to nearly so much advantage. In *earthenware* we were masters, as of old; but in *china* and in *porcelain* our general excellence was stoutly denied, although individual excellencies were very apparent. In *hardware* we maintained our superiority, but were manifestly surprised at the rapid advances made by other nations."—*Lecture* on pp. 89, 90; or, in the volume of *Lectures*, pp. 193-195.

With these facts and opinions before us, we cannot but conclude, as Dr. Playfair does, that many foreign nations, and even those who were obviously in our rear, have been advancing in the race of industry *at a greater rate than our own*;—and if this be true we *must be left behind*. But this palpable truth, which Dr. Playfair seems almost unwilling directly to declare, he subsequently brings out in a form as startling as it is pregnant with instruction and warning:—

"All the visitors," he says, "both foreign and British, were agreed upon one point,—that whichever might be the first of the exhibiting nations—regarding which there were many opinions—that certainly our great rival France was *second*. Let us hope that in this there is no historical parallel. After the battle of Salamis, the generals, though claiming for each other the first consideration as to generalship, unanimously admitted that Themistocles deserved the second; and the world ever since, as Smith remarks, has accepted this as a proof that Themistocles *was beyond all question the first general*."—*Ib.*, pp. 90, 195.

Although Dr. Playfair, as an Englishman, expresses the hope that there is no historical parallel between the Exhibiting Nations and the Athenian generals, he must doubtless admit, as a logician, that *the world* will accept his statement, and the opinion of "all the visitors, foreign and British," as a proof that *France was the first exhibiting nation in the Crystal Palace*.

But whatever be the opinion which we form of the relative progress of exhibiting nations, we are now all agreed on the great point, that the time has arrived when science must be united with skill in the advancement of the Industrial Arts, and that this union can be effected only by a grand effort, individual and national, to establish upon a permanent basis a metropolitan university of arts and manufactures. This scheme has been pressed on the attention of the Royal Commission by memorials from many influential bodies. The magistrates and manufacturers of Birmingham and Bristol, who contributed so largely to the funds as well as to the contents of the Exhibition, have in an able memorial pointed out the necessity of an Industrial University. "Having long felt the necessity of some more extended system of practical and scientific education in England, which

would place within the reach of the industrial classes a much higher standard of scientific attainments," than they could otherwise reach, they express their conviction "that with greater facilities in elementary scientific education, intimately connected with and always accompanied by practical illustrations and manipulations, there would be found as much original genius and talent to develop in the people of this country as in those of the great continental states of Europe." They had seen in Paris the great Industrial Institutions with their efficient and interesting museums under the charge of the State, where numerous young men "the most eminent of the age," had received the systematic education which had raised them to rank, consideration, and fortune, and they longed for similar institutions in their own country. They admitted, with gratitude, that Government had made a great step by the establishment of schools of design, and the Museum of Practical Geology, though "the first were only partial in their advantages, and the latter only an *isolated branch* limited in its influence." They therefore solicit the Commissioners "that a great central college of arts and manufactures should be established in London, and endowed with the whole surplus receipts of the Exhibition;" "that a museum of arts and manufactures should be established at the college, the basis of which might be selected from the present Exhibition; that provincial schools, having the same object in view, should be connected with the great central college, and carried on under the same system, and that the public should have a voice in a general system of education of such vital importance to their own commercial prosperity."

Views similar to those of large municipal bodies had presented themselves to several individuals, and there can be no doubt that the Prince himself, and his distinguished colleagues in the Commission, had at a very early period contemplated the establishment of a national system of Industrial teaching. Mr. F. Twining, junior, had, as early as 1849, communicated to Mr. Scott Russell the idea of such an institution, analogous to the *Gewerbe Institut* at Berlin, and in a letter addressed to the Earl of Shaftesbury in August 1851, he proposes an Industrial College as the means of improving the efficiency of British artisans. His scheme embraces five points,—1. The establishment by Royal Charter of a Central College on a large scale, in or near the Metropolis, and *sufficiently endowed* to secure its permanent efficiency; 2. The establishment of evening schools in all large towns, for the professional instruction of apprentices, and connected with the central institute; 3. That qualified journeymen shall be admitted as inmates of the college; 4. That diplomas and certificates of merit shall be given after due examination; and 5thly, That a

Museum of Industry shall be established containing specimens, models, or diagrams, illustrating the latest improvements and inventions.

The important subject of a great Central Institution of Arts and Manufactures has been viewed in all its various phases and relations by Prince Albert and the Royal Commissioners, and they have resolved to devote to its establishment the Exhibition Fund amounting to upwards of £150,000. The specific plan that has been adopted by the Commission will be made public in their Second Report, which will very speedily be published; but whatever the details of the plan may be, we may rest assured, from what we know of the capacity of the Prince and of the wisdom and talents of his coadjutors, that it will as far transcend the ideas that have yet been made public, as the Exhibition itself transcended the highest expectations of its friends. The Institution will of course consist of a College or University, with laboratories and workshops, a museum and a library. An ample staff of professors carefully selected, and uniting practical with theoretical science, will deliver regular courses of lectures,—a number of tutors analogous to the *Répétiteurs* of the *Ecole Centrale* will assist the pupils in their preparations both for the class and public examinations; while well informed and skilful workmen will superintend the chemical and other manipulations in the laboratory, and the mechanical and handicraft operations in the workshops. In addition to these teachers, we would strongly recommend the addition of Honorary or Emeritus professors—men of high name and lofty acquirements, who would occasionally give one or more lectures to the assembled students. The association of such men would give dignity to the Institution, inspire the youth with the desire to emulate them, and form a link between the artists and manufacturers and the upper classes of society, with whom our most distinguished men are in the habit of associating.

The Museum will, of course, consist of *three* parts—of the collection of raw materials and fabrics, the subjects of export and import throughout the world,—a collection of tools, scientific apparatus, instruments, and models,—and a department of actually working machines. This museum, which is peculiarly a desideratum in England, will answer another great purpose beside that of instruction. When the public attention is turned to the value of practical science, and to the importance of encouraging every new idea, and every species of invention, and above all, when they have learned that there cannot be a *frivolous* patent, the present patent laws* cannot fail to be repealed,

* The Patent Amendment Law, just passed, is certainly a great improvement upon the former law; but a tax of such magnitude as it still imposes on inventors

and an inalienable privilege given to the patentee on the report of a Board of Commissioners. For the use of such a Board, the hall of models and the collection of apparatus and instruments will be of essential use, by enabling them to decide on the novelty of inventions submitted to their judgment.

The establishment of affiliated Schools of Industry in the provinces will follow in the train of the great Central Institution. At these primary Industrial Schools the youth will be prepared for their higher studies in the metropolis; and we have no doubt that our private academies, our parochial and other schools, and even our universities and colleges, will tell the Rev. Mr. Zincke that they will no longer "continue to teach only what was taught two or three centuries ago;" and that they will accommodate their system of instruction to that "high education which embraces the whole range of our present knowledge, and has a direct reference to the wants of a free, busy, and enlightened age."

Extensive as this plan necessarily is, it is contemplated by the Prince and the Commissioners to offer sites, in the locality which they have acquired, to all the institutions in the metropolis connected with science and the arts. The National Gallery will here find a valuable and appropriate resting-place, and the various Societies* which, we believe, are required, on account of the want of Government offices, to quit their apartments in Somerset House, will be desirous of having new and more commodious halls erected for them by the State in the same locality. Other institutions, such as the School of Mines, (the Museum of Practical Geology,) the Linnæan, the Geographical, the Chemical, the Microscopic, and the Meteorological Societies, will seek an

is a disgrace to the statute book. Its provisions are as follow: One patent only is necessary for the United Kingdom and the Colonies,—protection for six months is given for a fee of £5; at the end of six months a fee of £6 is paid for the notice to proceed with the patent; the other fees are, £5 for sealing, and £5 for filing the specification; at the expiry of the third year, £40 is to be paid—and at the expiry of the seventh year, £80: The stamp-duties are, £5 for warrant of law officer, £10 for certificate that the fee of £40 is paid, and £20 for certificate that the fee of £80 is paid:—These fees amount in all to £176!! So that, if Mr. Watt presented to the public his steam-engine, or Messrs. Cooke and Wheatstone their electric telegraphs, they must each pay £176, without any security that their inventions will be protected from piracy. A Protectionist Government would not be worth an hour's purchase were it to inflict a fine of £176 upon a tenant-farmer who discovered a cheap and efficient manure, or upon an agricultural mechanist who invented the most perfect reaping-machine. It is a problem of the indeterminate kind, why England exacts £176 for a privilege which other nations, less dependent on inventions, confer for the tenth part of the sum; and it is one, in our judgment, absolutely incapable of solution, why the wealthiest country in the world, and the most dependent on art and science, should demand a price for a right which ought to be given for nothing, or paid for as a boon to the nation.

* The Royal Society, the Society of Antiquaries, the Geological and the Astronomical Societies.

asylum in the same sacred grove; and while all these institutions will maintain their former independence, and be regulated by their own laws, their libraries and their collections might, as a measure of economy, as well as of utility, be united under the same apartments and managed by the same officers.

We now approach a question, of vast importance, which we have no doubt has been anxiously considered by Prince Albert and the Commissioners: Is the great institution, of which we have been writing, to be a self-supporting one? or is it to be national, and endowed by the Government? Mr. Twining never doubts "that it must be founded under Royal Charter, and sufficiently endowed to secure its permanent efficiency." All the Industrial Institutions on the Continent flourish under state endowment; and if the locality is purchased and the buildings erected by the Exhibition Funds, the Government cannot refuse to supply the annual expenditure and maintenance of the college by a handsome endowment. Experience will not permit us to place in the hands of Government the right of appointing the professors and the other necessary functionaries. A general superintendence, confined to the right of inquiry in the case of maladministration, is all the power that can be safely intrusted to political patrons.

The Prince and the Commissioners have no doubt adopted some decided views relative to the nature and character of the studies which are to be pursued within the College. Generally speaking, there will be little difference of opinion on that subject; but there is one phase of it upon which a variety of opinions will be entertained, and which, therefore, requires to be viewed in all its bearings. What is the relation between abstract Science and Art? What are the influences which they mutually exert upon each other? And to what extent is abstract science, independent of its applications, to be introduced into the curriculum of study, or demanded from students who may have received their scientific education in other institutions? These are questions of fundamental importance. Dr. Whewell* has made some reference to the first in his admirable Lecture on the General Bearing of the Exhibition; and Dr. Playfair,† in his most appropriate and eloquent discourse "On the Study of Abstract Science, as essential to the Progress of Industry," has indicated very clearly the answer he would give to all our questions. It is well known, however, that practical men, not defective in judgment, and especially civil-engineers, have spoken and written rather contemptuously of the value of abstract

* *Lectures on the Results of the Exhibition*, Lect. i., pp. 3-34.

† *Records of the School of Mines*, pp. 23-48.

science in the professions depending on chemical, mathematical, and mechanical knowledge. It is oftener thought than said, "that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory;" but without denying that there may be theories of which this equation is true, we venture to say that we could name many examples in which an ounce of theory has produced many tons of practice. Dr. Whewell has made some observations, which without any design on his part may be regarded as giving a kind of predominance to art over science. Regarding science as the "natural and general succession to art," as "criticism is to poetry," he pronounces *art to be "the mother of science—the vigorous and comely mother of a daughter of far loftier and serener beauty;"* or as he elsewhere expresses it, "Men were led to seek for science as well as art; for science is the natural complement of art, and fulfilment of the thoughts and hopes which art excites; for *science is the fully-developed blossom of which art is the wonderfully-involved bud.*" It is true, as Dr. Whewell remarks in support of this opinion, that there were good artificers in brass and iron before the principles of the chemistry of metals were known;—but these principles were not deduced from the works of Tubal-cain, or Bènvenuto Cellini, or any of their successors. It is true also that wine cheered the heart of man before he knew the philosophy of vinous fermentation;—but that philosophy never sprung from the fermented juice of the grape. It is true, too, that pyramids, and obelisks, and cyclopæan walls, and pillars and entablatures of gigantic Doric, long preceded "a theory of mechanical powers;"—but the pulley, the wedge, and the lever were not derived from the art which raised these mighty masses from the ground; and at this moment we do not even know by what power they were lifted into the air. We are not acquainted, indeed, with a single case where science sprung from art. The harp and organ of Jubal never taught us the principles of Acoustics, nor have we learned from the gopher ark of Noah the Strength of materials and the doctrines of Carpentry. Even the magnificent Temple of Solomon, with its costly stones, its pillars of brass, and its vessels of silver and of gold, has not shed a ray of light upon the humblest of the sciences. Necessity, as the proverb tells us, was the mother of invention; but science never had a mother. She sprang, like Minerva, from the brain of Jove, not full grown, but with the elements of growth;—not an organic body, but a germ to be organized;—not a tree rejoicing in its foliage, but a seed to become the parent of luxuriant forests, destined to give shelter and food to man, and elaborate its leaves for the healing of the nations.

But while science has been thus independent in her march, art has, in a direction converging with hers, ever been vigilant

and energetic in the cause of humanity. Before science, her younger sister, was born, she had given shelter, and food and raiment to man ;—she had provided luxuries for his board, and medicines for his cure, and arms for his defence ;—she had entrenched him in the cloud-capt tower, and lodged him in the gorgeous palace ; and she had, for his use, turned the Oxus from its course, and swelled the Jaxartes with the waters of its sister stream. She has travelled over continents on the chariot's iron wing, and she has marched over the mountain waves in her arks of wood and of iron ; and acting in co-operation with her younger sister, she holds out to us the prospect of fresh achievements over sublunary matter and terrestrial space.

In contemplating science and art in their separate spheres, there is in each a most essential feature, which, though it may not affect the family likeness, gives to the one a loftier mien and a diviner form ;—it is the celestial halo which encircles the Madonna of Science. Earth-born, and chained to the earth, Art, in her highest aspirations, whether useful, or ornamental, or imaginative, works with terrestrial materials, and contemplates but terrestrial forms. The mechanist has not found the place (the *που στω*) from which he can move the earth with his lever, nor has he been able to span the shortest space in our system. His presumptuous hopes were buried under the ruins of his Babel Tower. The engineer has not thought of navigating the ethereal ocean of universal space, and he has not even solicited the aid of a Company to navigate the atmosphere in which he lives and breathes. The practical chemist has not essayed the air and the earth of our neighbour planets, nor analyzed the glorious emanations which telegraph throughout universal space the eternal truth, that God is Light, and that in Him there is no darkness at all.

Hence it is that Art preceded Science without giving her birth. When man received the earth as his freehold, he was surrounded with natural objects from which he had to supply his more immediate necessities ; but no sooner were his physical wants supplied, than his intellectual powers came into play, and physical truths and physical laws were the result of his labour. Science now threw her auroral beams upon the mountain range of art, and in her meridian path developed the principles and laws of material nature. It was science alone that rounded the earth on which we dwell—that turned the gigantic sphere round its axis, to be lighted and heated by the God of Day—that placed the sun on the throne of our system, and separated that system from the universe of stars. It was the lamp of science that conducted the geologist into the dark caverns of the earth, to disinter its dead, to excavate its riches, and to read to man

the mortifying lesson, that he is as much an upstart in her chronology as he is an atom among her everlasting hills. It was science that converted the microscope from its drop of water and its lens of glass into that noble instrument which is every hour disclosing the otherwise unseen creations of unparalleled wisdom ; and it is science that has swollen the spy-glass of Galileo into the colossal tube with which Lord Rosse is contemplating the infinitely distant and the infinitely great.

But while science has thus transcended art in expounding mysteries which the latter never pretended to approach, she has outstripped her handmaid in theories which art might have been expected to reduce to practice. The chemical philosopher has determined the elements of the diamond ; but the artist has not electrified them into the brilliant gem. The mathematician has discovered the true form of a perfect lens ; but the optician has not succeeded in giving the hyperbolic form to his materials. The natural philosopher has shewn how to make telescopes perfectly achromatic ; but the artist in glass cannot furnish the materials necessary to construct them. The natural philosopher has taught us the use of electricity as a moving power, and as a source of heat and of light ; but art has not yet taught us to apply it in moving our ships, or in heating our dwellings, or in lighting our streets.

In thus pointing out to those who are not deeply versed in the principles and history of science, the relations between art and science, our object is to prepare the reader for the great truth advocated by Dr. Playfair, "that the study of abstract science is essential to the progress of industry." By means of numerous and instructive examples, in which the most abstract chemical and physical truths have resulted in the most valuable practical applications, in the establishment of new arts and new manufactures, he has shewn to the "practical men," and to the ignorantly learned, if the prejudices of the one and the incapacity of the other will allow them to see it, that "practice and science must now join together in a solemn union," and "that the time is past when practice can go on in the blind and vain confidence of a shallow empiricism, severed from science like a tree from its roots." "It is indispensable," he adds, "for this country to have a scientific education in connexion with manufactures, if we wish to outstrip the intellectual competition which now, happily for the world, prevails in all departments of industry. As surely as darkness follows the setting of the sun, so surely will England recede as a manufacturing nation unless her industrial population become much more conversant with science than they now are."

: That these views are not peculiar to ourselves, or to the dis-

tinguished chemist whom we have quoted, might be shewn by numerous references to the various lectures on the subject of the Exhibition, and to the reports of the different juries which will soon be published. In advocating the same truth, a foreigner peculiarly acquainted with the relations between abstract and practical science, and with the working of the educational institutions on the Continent, the illustrious Liebig, has told the world, and England in particular, with whose wants he is well acquainted, "that the great desideratum of the present age is practically manifested in the establishment of schools in which the national sciences occupy the most prominent place in the course of instruction. From these schools a more vigorous generation will come forth, powerful in understanding, qualified to appreciate and to accomplish all that is truly great, and to bring forth fruits of universal usefulness. Through them the resources, the wealth, and the strength of empires will be incalculably increased." In a similar strain has the illustrious Humboldt, the prince and patriarch of philosophers, pled the cause of abstract science as the fountain of national wealth, and the source of national greatness and security.

"An equal appreciation," he says, "of all parts of knowledge, is an especial requirement of the present epoch, in which the material wealth and the increasing prosperity of nations are in a great measure based on a more enlightened employment of natural products and forces. The most superficial glance at the present condition of European States shows, that those which linger in the race cannot hope to escape the partial diminution and perhaps the final annihilation of their resources. It is with nations as with nature, which, according to a happy expression of Goethe, knows no pause in ever-increasing movement, development, and production—a curse still cleaving to standing still.

"Nothing but serious occupation with chemistry and natural and physical science can defend a State from the consequences of competition. Man can produce no effect upon nature, or appropriate her powers, unless he is conversant with her laws, and with their relations to material objects according to measure and numbers. And in this lies the power of popular intelligence, which rises or falls as it encourages or neglects this study. Science and information are the joy and justification of mankind. They form the springs of a nation's wealth, being often indeed substitutes for those material riches which nature has in many cases distributed with so partial a hand. Those nations which remain behind in manufacturing activity, by neglecting the practical applications of the mechanical arts and of industrial chemistry, to the transmission, growth, or manufacture of raw materials—those nations among whom respect for such activity does not pervade all classes—must inevitably fall from any prosperity they may have attained; and this by so much the more certainly and speedily

as neighbouring States, instinct with the power of youthful renovation, in which science and the arts of industry operate or lend each other mutual assistance, are seen pressing forward in the race."

Assuming, then, as an incontestable truth, and one admitted by the nation, that abstract science is necessary to the improvement and perfection of the practical arts, and that it is required from the student in the new College of Industry, we come to the discussion of a question not less important than any we have been considering. From what quarter are we to obtain the abstract science which we need, and how are we to obtain it in the largest quantity and of the best quality? Science is an article of which a certain quantity is produced annually in every civilized nation. It has therefore two forms—that which is *imported*, and that which is *indigenous*. Our imported science is introduced directly into this country in books, in scientific journals, and in the memoirs of foreign academies, and indirectly, in scientific instruments and apparatus manufactured abroad. These books and these instruments are taxed by an import duty, the one by *weight* and the other by *value*; so that the science which we have been lauding as the mainstay of our arts is actually a prohibited article, and prohibited, too, by the consent of the very legislators who are commissioners for the establishment of our industrial colleges! But when our imported books, and memoirs, and journals, and instruments, reach the learned individuals, who either purchase them, or receive them gratuitously from their authors, or from the academies of which they are members, they would be of little avail to art, and of as little use for public instruction, unless they were translated into our own language, and either published separately, or diffused through the nation in our scientific journals. It is well known, however, that a book of abstract science will not sell in this country owing to the heavy imposts upon knowledge—the tax upon the paper upon which it is printed, and the tax upon the advertisements which are required to make it known to the public. For the same reasons our scientific journals are unable to afford the expense of translations and abstracts from the scientific productions of foreign countries, and of the diagrams and plates which are so frequently necessary for their illustration. The consequence of this is, that we have not in England, or Scotland, or Ireland a single Journal of Science, or Magazine of Art of the least merit—either well conducted, well illustrated, or well circulated; and those which we have are neither patronized nor read by the nobility and gentry of the land, and scarcely looked into even by those who are most deeply interested in the advancement of science, both theoretical and practical. Hence our imported science is kept in bond through the apathy of our

legislators, maintaining scientific ignorance among the people, and checking the progress of science and the industrial arts. Thus hostile to *imported* science, we should expect that our statesmen would be very friendly to that which is *indigenous*. But here, too, the ignorance and illiberality of our Governments stand in painful contrast with the wisdom and generosity of those of every other nation. Instead of being encouraged, our indigenous science labours under disabilities, as if an article of contraband, which it is the interest of the State to seize, or an immoral importation, which it is their duty to suppress. If important discoveries require for their description and illustration to be consigned in elaborate memoirs, our voluntary associations of philosophers, with limited means at their command, cannot afford to publish them; or if they can, they may possibly refuse, because their publication may interfere with the scientific claims of some of themselves or their functionaries. If the author desires or is obliged to publish his discoveries in a separate work, no bookseller will hazard the expense of printing and illustrating a volume, the sale of which will hardly repay the duty on paper and advertisements with which it is taxed. The consequence of all this is, that many English philosophers write books and memoirs of great learning and value which are never published, and others would willingly write them, were there any probability of their paying, as they do in foreign countries, the expense of publication.

If, on the other hand, our indigenous science is enshrined in a process, or instrument, or machine, which has required years for its elaboration or construction, the law will seize the property, as belonging to the public, if the confiding inventor has accidentally allowed his secret to transpire, or employed a faithless assistant to aid him in his labours.* As justly might the bystander appropriate the purse of gold that has dropped from his sovereign's hand, or the slave merchant claim the white child that has strayed from its home. But even if the inventor has kept his secret, by making use of no other hands but his own—a work of extreme difficulty, and itself injurious to the development of his invention or discovery—he must purchase a fourteen years' right of receiving any benefit from his labours, by paying in exchange for that right the sum of £176, (at present till the 1st of October 1852, between £300 and £500,) the public being put in possession of all the results of his invention, which it may have cost him many hundred pounds to secure. Some liberal friend or generous benefactor may perchance assist

* The late Lord Eldon, in the trial of a patent right, declared, that if he intended to take out a patent for an invention, he would not confide the secret of it even to his brother.

the poor inventor to discharge the preliminary debt; but no sooner does he send his invention into the market, or offer licenses for the use of his instrument or process, than he is assailed by pirates, who openly rob him of his invention, on the ground of some trivial defect in his specification, or on the allegation that he has not clearly described his invention, or that it has been somewhere described before. If our indigenous science then is proscribed, in place of being fostered, by our Patent Laws, and if it is admitted on all hands that it is required by our industrial institutions as the mother and companion of art, some arrangements must be made to supply it in due abundance and of the requisite quality. It will no doubt be said, that we have the Royal Society and the other scientific institutions of the Empire engaged in the prosecution of abstract science, and the School of Mines actively occupied in the same cause. Referring to former articles,* in which we have pointed out the defects of all voluntary associations, and especially our own, let us consider for a moment how such institutions must work in reference to the advancement of science. Those who labour for the Royal Society, for example, namely, the philosophers who contribute to its transactions, are its own members principally, or those who might be its members if they could afford it. These individuals, to whom, as well as to the active and unpaid officers of the society, the country is under the deepest obligations, carry on the researches to which accident or their own individual tastes may have directed them, consign the result of their labours in the Society's Transactions. Whole branches of science, such as those pointed out by Sir John Herschell,† are thus entirely neglected, and not even pursued in the Empire. Now this is an undoubted and essential feature in all voluntary institutions, and it is impossible to remedy the evil unless the society had power of appointing committees of their number to devote themselves as in the Institute of France, and other foreign academies, to special departments of science.

In societies supported by an entrance fee, and the annual contributions of its members, amounting in some cases when compounded for to £50 and upwards, the subscription is in reality a tax upon science, and when levied as it is from men of small income, stealing a little leisure for research from their professional avocations, or, what we know to be the case, sacrificing their professional gains on the altar of science, we cannot but view it, though freely paid, as worse than any of the taxes that have

* See this Journal, vol. vii. p. 230, and vol. xiv. p. 280, and Mr. Babbage's two works on the Decline of Science, and on the Exposition of 1851, *passim*

† See page 531 of this Number, and vol. xiv. p. 240.

ever been levied by financial cupidity; for we must regard it as virtually imposed by the Government that refuses to sustain our scientific institutions. Heavier still does such a tax fall upon the men of genius, who, as Mr. Glaisher* well expresses it, "are content to pass by the beaten tracks to wealth and preferment, and choose that which successfully pursued would lead them to renown," but meeting with obstacles which they cannot surmount, "the far greater number of those who are well qualified by talent, education, and bias, to add to the stores of science and shed lustre on their country, are compelled to turn aside to the smoother paths leading to professions which hold out inducements to their pursuit." In this manner is the staff of science diminished in number and in genius; and the finest and most vigorous minds in the nation, who would light up our manufactures with their science, and supply its brightest fuel to our industry, are thus rusticated in professions whose duties could be sufficiently discharged by inferior minds.

But while want of position scares the young philosopher from the bleak domain of scientific research, there is no motive but that of future fame to allure him from the field where wealth and professional distinction may be surely won. When the honours of the State have been conceded to the most distinguished of our philosophers, they have been of the lowest kind, and instead of being the spontaneous and generous emanations from the seat of power, they are but withered leaves which faction throws from her own laurelled bust to gratify a political partisan, or perchance to pay by a transferable bond the wages of corruption.

With these facts before us we are driven to the conclusion, that from the voluntary character of our scientific institutions, and the ignorance and parsimony of our Government, a supply of indigenous science, abundant in quantity and high in quality, cannot be commanded to meet the wants of our new industrial institutions. This therefore is the time for the true patrons of art and industry—the Prince and the Royal Commissioners, to earn a double laurel from their country, by reforming our scientific as well as our industrial institutions. The national feeling developed by the Exhibition marks the time, and the proposed local union of all our societies points to the occasion when this great intellectual revolution should be accomplished. The bold minister who now wields the power of the State, has, at this auspicious moment, promised, through Her Majesty, and declared it to be his duty, to "develop as well as to encourage industry, art, and

* Lectures on the Results of the Exposition, p. 395. See also Habbage's Exposition of 1851, pp. 236, 242.

science." With no common feelings shall we watch the glorious sunrise of which this announcement may be the dawn; and yet not without some mingling fear that the promise thus given to science may be one of those political pledges which are made in weakness and broken in power, or but a passing sentiment which has escaped from the hand of the minister, without having thrilled through his heart. Athwart the darkness of the future the brightest ray of the present but dimly shines, and that sun whose ruddy orb is nearing our horizon may yet rise in darkness deeper than the presaging dawn. We nevertheless confide in the loyalty of the statesman's heart, though we may doubt the strength of his arm. The royal lip, however, has stamped the pledge as sincere: The approbation of the Prince may seal its accomplishment; and with such securities we hail it as an augury of the triumph of British science, and of British industry, and therefore of social wealth and contentment. Our new legislature has yet to indorse the fiat of the Cabinet, and fulfil the desire of the throne; but even if ignorance and faction shall still combine to thwart our intellectual progress, we trust it will never be recorded in history's enduring page, that a British statesman had broken at noon the vow which he had made at midnight,—insulting the sovereign by whose lips that vow was embalmed, and the nation whose hopes it raised, and whose interests it involved.

- ART. IX.—1. *Political Elements, or the Progress of Modern Legislation.* By JOSEPH MOSELEY, B.C.L. London, 1852.
2. *On the Method of Observation and Reasoning in Politics.* By G. CORNEWALL LEWIS. 2 vols. London, 1852.

THE present condition of our "Political Elements" in England, while to the superficial observer it offers little but a scene of chaos and contention, is yet discernible by those who look below the first appearance of things to be fraught with the most hopeful possibilities. Rightly understood, the crisis through which we are now passing is that shattering and crumbling away of the old which necessarily precedes the creation of the new. Rightly used, it is one of those epochs of disruption and transition which should become the seed-time of a nation's future. It is the closing of one chapter in our political history, and should be the opening of another and a brighter page. The questions which have divided parties for the last century are all set at rest; the old battles have been fought and won; the old disputes have died and been buried; everything about which politicians formerly differed, has either been finally disposed of, or has ceased to be a matter for disagreement; old antagonists and hereditary foes look each other in the face, bewildered to find that the point of contention has vanished from between them; but, having been enemies so long, they fancy they must be enemies still, and so cast about them for new positions of hostility and new points of difference. Instead of rising out of the rut of custom, and hailing with joy the termination of the ancestral war, they deem it necessary to invent or discover topics and pretexts for keeping up at least a semblance of the old antagonism. It is hopeless and unwise, as well as utterly gratuitous, to strive at this day to keep up the old distinctions of Whig and Tory: the vitality has died out of one party; the ground has been cut away from under the other; the old banners of both are torn; the old watchwords of both are meaningless and obsolete; the doctrines of the two are now inextricably blended; and a new opponent has risen up to combat both alike, and to test whatever of truth may yet remain in their principles, or of energy in their attenuated frames.

We may regret this state of things; but we cannot deny it. The old men—the *laudatores temporis acti*—those who live only in the associations and worship only the glories of the past, mourn over the change, and sigh for the days of well-defined Parliamentary armies, and of political contests carried on according to the ancient rules of courteous warfare. The younger

and the newer race of patriots and statesmen rejoice at the prospect of a time when Parliament shall be an assembly met to deliberate with a single mind, amicably and in union, on the welfare of a nation equally dear to all—not an arena wherein gladiators struggle for victory over the bleeding body of a prostrate country. But to both alike the *fact* has become obvious. The old Tory party is as extinct as the old Jacobite party. Its culminating point was during the Napoleonic wars: it began to languish with the peace, and every subsequent year dealt it a death wound, till it finally succumbed with Lord Eldon at the date of the Reform Bill. A genuine Tory of the old school is now almost a fossil animal, and at least as rare as the mammoth or the megatherium. The fathers have died out; and the sons have done homage to the spirit of the times. They have taken up a position far in advance of their predecessors: have borrowed something from their former antagonists; have learned much from observation and reflection; and in many things the young Conservatives are more truly liberal and popular than the old Whigs. The Whigs, again, are effete even more than they are changed; they are out of date; what made them a party is all gone; the popular control of the Crown—Catholic Emancipation—Parliamentary Reform—a foreign diplomacy sympathizing with constitutional government elsewhere,—all these points of policy have been adopted by the nation, and are no longer distinctive of a party. And the principles which were formerly the chief and most honourable characteristics of the Radicals while they were few and powerless, viz.—economy in the public expenditure, the abolition of jobs and abuses, and non-interference with the internal affairs of the Continent, are now proclaimed by all parties alike. The sober among Radicals differ in scarcely an appreciable degree from the more liberal among the Whigs; while between the aristocratic Whigs and the rational and popularizing Conservatives lies only the shadow of a name. Everywhere the old party landmarks are swept away, or stand far out at sea—monuments to shew how far the tide of circumstances and progress has carried all parties alike from the positions they once occupied.

Instead, therefore, of endeavouring artificially to prolong an unnatural and condemned existence, to breathe renewed life into the hollow and decaying carcase of a sham, and to give forced and galvanic motion to things which have no longer a real and self-sustained vitality,—let us unreluctantly allow “the dead past to bury its dead,” and, seizing with glad energy upon so rare an opportunity of shaking ourselves free from the shackles of worn-out formulas and hampering engagements, inquire if it be not possible to suggest some new combinations of the rich

“political elements” still left to us, which shall be based upon more real and enduring distinctions, and fruitful of grander and more beneficent results.

The actual state of affairs in the parliamentary world is felt by all to be neither dignified, satisfactory, nor safe. Representative government is not honoured by the spectacle of the first deliberative assembly in the world floating hither and thither over the sea of legislation without rudder and without compass, blown about by every wind of doctrine, a prey to every manœuvre of faction. Parties and sections seem to be becoming more and more multiplied and fluctuating, and none of them to have any firm position, any fixed policy, any tenacious or enduring bond of union, except, indeed, it be the Manchester School and the Irish “Brigade.” While no party has a definite purpose at once high enough to avow and clear enough to follow; while none is strong enough to control or overpower the others, or to pursue an independent and untrimming course; while each, though unable to act itself, is able to fetter and prohibit action to any of its rivals; while the government is too weak to exist except upon sufferance and by connivance, and yet the opposition too unstable and divided to overthrow and to replace it;—in such a state of things the feeblest faction rises into dangerous importance, and the wildest project acquires a formidable chance of temporary triumph; individuals, whom an energetic administration or the general good sense of the House renders insignificant and innoxious in ordinary times, become endowed with a tenfold capacity for mischief; casual support is purchased by unworthy concessions, and plans and doctrines are listened to and temporized with, that in better days would be scouted ignominiously and without a hearing. Nor is this the worst: amid party squabbles imperial interests are forgotten or cast into the shade; each faction is so intent on the maintenance of its own position, or the assault of its adversary’s camp—so absorbed in the petty tactics of attack and defence—that other and far greater questions, domestic, colonial, and international, are pushed into the background; the question of Chancery reform is postponed to the far inferior one of who shall be the Chancellor; the settlement of our financial system is shoved aside and evaded by the contrivance of a provisional budget; the issue of a nearly balanced division excites more concern than the possibility of a foreign invasion; and friendly powers may be offended, and invaluable colonies alienated and disgusted, because the instinct of self-preservation engrosses the whole mind and energies of those to whom the welfare of the country has been entrusted.

We should, therefore, deprecate in the strongest manner the continuance of Lord Derby’s ministry in office, even if it were in

any way likely that the result of the general election should so alter the relative position of parties as to enable them to command a majority on all measures of immediate necessity to the business of the country. We can easily imagine, that while their opponents are divided as now into so many sections, the present ministers might contrive,—by submitting to a life of ingenious stratagems and consummate tact; by pushing forward such measures of reform as the country demands and all parties would concur in supporting; by carefully avoiding all questions which might evoke a general expression of hostile opinion; by postponing or putting aside all proposals on which their defeat would be a matter of certainty; by exciting and bringing into the foreground those discussions which would divide their antagonists, and throwing into the background the topics which would unite them; by attention to all complaints, by courtesy to all suggestions; by a few wise improvements which they might easily introduce into the transaction of public business, and by doing the actual work of office with judgment and despatch,—to acquire a certain small and artificial credit, and to prolong, almost indefinitely, a languid and undignified existence. There are many in the country, we believe, who even wish for such a state of things, men who look to immediate gain and disregard secondary and remote results, who have learned that concessions are most easily wrung from a feeble and tolerated government, and who set a high value on the steps towards reform, and the irrevocable admissions in favour of reform, which a Conservative administration is compelled to make in order to retain its power. They observe that a liberal party generally becomes timid and reactive when in office, and is supported by a Tory opposition in its timidity and reaction; whereas the Tory party always becomes reforming and liberal when in office, and is aided and dragged forward in its liberalizing course by the reforming opposition. Thus reform, they say, always advances faster under the rule of its enemies than of its friends. There is some truth and some wisdom in the policy of those who reason thus; but it is partial truth and a short-sighted policy. The immediate advantage is perceived; but the price at which it is purchased is kept out of sight. There is no doubt that of late years the Conservatives have always improved in office and the Whigs in opposition. But this improvement may be dearly bought by a lowering of the standard of public morality, and by a corrupt, careless, or reactionary spirit systematically pervading the distribution of appointments.

An Administration has three sets of functions to perform—three classes of duties which the country expects from it,—viz., a wise general legislative policy; a skilful management of the business of the various Government departments; and a judi-

cious and patriotic distribution of its patronage. The importance of this last branch of ministerial duty is seldom sufficiently estimated. A Cabinet may do this well, and other matters ill. A Government may be timid and ineffective in its general action; its legislative schemes may be imperfect and ill-contrived; it may manage the official routine of administration with a somewhat lax and unpractised hand; and yet it may be preferable to its rivals, and it may be important to retain it in power, at all events for a time, because its appointments are carefully, sagaciously, and honestly made. Or the converse of this proposition may be just. It is no trifling matter whether the immense patronage of the Government—especially in the higher class of appointments—shall be in the hands of men who, whatever their feebleness or their faults, earnestly desire progress, ardently love freedom, and conscientiously endeavour to find the fittest candidates for every post;—or, in the hands of men whose hearts are in the past, who dread the march of mind, who abhor all mental liberty and daring, the whole spirit of whose policy would, though unavowedly, be steadily and systematically reactionary, and whose whole weight would be thrown into the scale of absolutism, at home and abroad. It is impossible to over-estimate the gradual and silent influences of good, or bad, appointments to the episcopate, to the bench, to the magistracy, to the government of colonies, to the inspectorship of schools, to the multitude of other posts at the disposal of the Executive,—in educating, inoculating, and regenerating the nation,—or the reverse. It is no slight matter that each vacancy among the bishops should be filled up by Ministers who will appoint a Stanley or a Sumner, instead of a Philpotts or a Wilberforce;—that the many hundred livings in the gift of the Crown should be conferred on clergymen who will carry the olive-branch of peace, instead of the torch of discord, into their respective parishes, who will attach, instead of alienating, the hearts of an earnest and inquiring generation. It is no trivial question whether a flood of rational piety, or a flood of rampant Puseyism—a religion of blessing, or a religion of cursing—shall be poured, year after year, over the land. It makes no small difference whether the judges who are elevated to the bench shall be lawyers who are bigoted to every old enormity, or lawyers who are earnest in favour of every beneficent reform—men like Eldon, or men like Romilly. It is no slight matter whether the magistrates who administer justice in the first resort, shall be of a character to make the law loved and respected, or hated and despised—whether they shall be real “justices of the peace,” or mere persecutors of vagrants and of poachers. In the course of a few years, the different

effects produced on the education of the people, by school-inspectors appointed for their wide sagacity, and school-inspectors appointed only for their narrow orthodoxy, will have been incalculable. And, finally, who can pretend to estimate the mighty and contrasted consequences which would be wrought on our colonial empire, our national strength, the happiness, prosperity, and loyalty of our numerous dependencies, by a series of governors sent out by a Reforming or a Tory Administration—a series of governors like Lord Dalhousie and Lord Elgin, or like Captain Fitzroy and Lord Torrington? Yet all these differences might, and to a great extent probably would, be produced by a simple change of the men who sat in Downing Street. The indirect influence of the real ingrained principles held by the members of the Cabinet, is often far greater and wider than their direct action. On this account we deprecate the continuance of the present Ministers in power.

We deprecate it, further, on the ground of public morality and Parliamentary honour, which of late years have received so many severe shocks. We have seen a Ministry come into power on the ground of the necessity of “the appropriation clause,” and resign that ground after they had been a year in office. We have seen a Ministry appointed and a Parliament elected, for the object of defeating the policy of commercial freedom, and end in carrying out that policy in its fullest meaning. We have seen a third Ministry unseat its antagonists on the question of a coercion bill for Ireland, and almost immediately find themselves compelled to propose a still more stringent one themselves. And if the country now allows a fourth Ministry to retain, as free-traders, offices which they have sought and obtained as Protectionists, it will have made itself a *particeps criminis*, and will have given its sanction to a system discreditable now, and ominous of future evil.

★ There is no worse augury for a nation's welfare than the prevalence of a low tone of public morality. Nothing is a surer indication of decline; nothing a more certain presage of approaching ruin. Where great criminals are leniently dealt with, and great crimes meet only with gentle and modified condemnation; when the past, however disreputable, is readily forgiven at the first promise of an amended future; when the prodigal son is promptly and without question welcomed back, though low tastes dictated the prodigality, and flagrant selfishness alone suggested the return; when a long and obstinate persistence in wrong is held to be cancelled by a month of tardy and convenient repentance; and when all the mischief wrought by a life of error can be atoned for and blotted out by final obedience to the majesty of truth,—there is much reason to fear

that a dangerous laxity is beginning to undermine those principles of right among statesmen and politicians which are the strongest safeguards of our national interests and honour. The idea that it is never too late to amend, and to reap the full reward of amendment, is no doubt a prodigious comfort to the frail and erring; but it is also a dreadful encouragement to the shrewd and calculating sinner to continue in his iniquity as long as the balance of immediate advantage seems to be in his favour. We can quite understand the unhesitating readiness with which all who are earnest in the pursuit of a great object will naturally hail the arrival of every recruit desirous of being enlisted in the same cause, without too close or severe an inquiry into his antecedents. We can sympathize to a great extent with the credulous cordiality which welcomes every fresh convert to our views, and thinks it ungracious to question the sincerity or the motives of the conversion. In the one case, the assistance brought to our cause, in the other, the homage paid to our doctrines, dispose us to think as well as possible of the superficial convert or the hollow ally; and in the immediate gain we are too apt to overlook and under-estimate the remote and insidious mischief. Our mistake, to use the words of Sir James Mackintosh, is that of "too readily allowing exceptions to general rules; that of too easy a permission of the use of doubtful means where the end seems to us good; that of believing, unphilosophically as well as dangerously, that there *can* be any scheme or measure as beneficial to the State, as the mere existence of men who would not do a base act for any public advantage."

For a long period we were too much given to idolize **CONSISTENCY** in our public men. Adherence to party, even when the party pursued an unprincipled course—adherence to former opinions, even when those opinions had become untenable, was long regarded as constituting the first and most sacred duty of a statesman. Change of opinion, or desertion of colleagues, was the one sin for which there was no forgiveness. A politician's obligation to his country was a tradesman's debt, which he ought to pay if he could: his obligations to his party were a debt of honour, which it was unpardonable not to discharge. Reflection and circumstances have greatly modified our feelings on this matter, and the tendency is now to run into the opposite extreme. Party ties have been so much broken up; changes of opinion have been so frequent, so serviceable, and so well defended; the education both of the nation and of statesmen has proceeded so rapidly of late, that the strangest tergiversations and conversions excite no surprise and little animadversion; and, provided only the change be in the right direction, we are too

ready to accept it as genuine and meritorious—even if it be tardy to a shameful degree, and timely to a most suspicious extent,—and to pass a general act of indemnity and oblivion for all the past. We must raise our voice against this tendency, as the offspring of a lax morality, and pregnant with much future danger.

Every individual change of policy or recantation of opinion on the part of leading public men, must stand upon its own merits : of the simple fact of inconsistency little, either good or bad, can be predicated. Each case must be judged by its antecedents and its concomitants. There have been, within recent recollection, some changes so rational, so gradual, so grounded on new knowledge, wider experience, and deeper study, so justified by the purest motives and the clearest necessity, so obviously honest because attended with much mortification, and punished by severe penalties,—that we class them among the most indisputable sacrifices of patriotic virtue. Such was that of Sir Robert Peel from 1842 to 1846. And there have been some recantations, also in the right direction, but so sudden, so audacious, so utterly unbased upon any additional facts, so inexcusable on the common plea of previous want of inquiry, so apparently traceable only to the one circumstance of altered position,—that it is impossible for the widest charity to elevate them into merits, or to give absolution to the subject of them. Such, it appears to us, was Mr. Disraeli's homage of adhesion to the principles and consequences of the financial policy of his antagonists, as displayed in his celebrated speech on the budget.

We can make every allowance for the case of those politicians who are *born* into a particular set of opinions, who inherit them from their parents, or imbibe them insensibly from their early associates. They have for years been accustomed to *take for granted* that their friends were right, and their adversaries wrong ; they have been in the habit of hearing and repeating the stock arguments on their own side of the question, without ever dreaming of the unsoundness of them ; and have never regarded the subject from their opponents' point of view. Hence, when new party combinations, or the increasing dangers of the country, compel them for the first time really to investigate matters with the single purpose of discovering the truth, and they perceive that they have all their life been unconsciously living on shallow fallacies, they are placed in a most embarrassing position. And if they candidly avow their error, we give them ready and generous absolution, approve heartily their final deviation into right, and reserve whatever blame must necessarily attach to them, for their former inconsiderateness, not for their present retraction.

Again: when a man has from any accident been thrown among a political party, whose notions and sentiments are uncongenial to his own; when the entanglement of personal ties or family connexions have long held him in that species of unwilling thralldom which it is particularly difficult for a sensitive and honourable man to escape from; when his whole career has been, though often unconsciously, a ceaseless struggle for emancipation; when on all occasions he has advocated those views of his party which, by their moderation, approached most nearly to those of the party which his false position obliged him to oppose; when his *tendencies* have always been obvious, and always in the same direction; and when, year after year, he has proceeded, casting off shackle after shackle, abjuring error after error, till his mind was ripe and the hour was come for the crowning, public, and decisive *métastasis*;—then we recognise in him no fitting subject for animadversion or reproach, but hail and applaud his final conversion as the matured fruit of a tree which has long been growing beneath our sight.*

We are even inclined to treat leniently, and to put the best construction upon another and very frequent cause of tergiversation. Many public men have taken up their opinions, if not hastily, yet at all events without due deliberation; they have fought for them zealously, but not always with a zeal according to knowledge; they have examined them, where they have examined at all, with the strong bias of a foregone conclusion; while in opposition, they have urged their views upon ministers with reckless heat and inconsistent confidence; but as soon as they are invested with the insignia and sobered by the cares of office, and are called upon to *act* upon their former principles, and therefore to reinvestigate them with all the new lights and under all the weighty responsibilities of power—they find, to their surprise, their confidence abated, their convictions becoming less vehement and dogmatic, and their former courage fast evaporating under the burden of ministerial obligations. For the first time in their life they sit down honestly to investigate matters with the real and sole determination to arrive at truth and fact; and for the first time they begin to perceive how deplorably mistaken they have hitherto been. It is not that the possession of office has supplied them with any *sinister* motives to a change of opinion; but that it has made them for the first time sincere, earnest, and unblinded inquirers. They were honest before: they are honest now; but before, they talked

* "The first inconstancy of unripe years
Is Nature's error on its way to truth."

Edwin the Fair, by Henry Taylor.

recklessly—now, they reflect cautiously. Their sin lies in their past, not in their present, conduct: they are culpable, not for acting and speaking *now* under an overpowering sense of duty and responsibility, but for having hitherto forgotten that opposition has its responsibilities as well as office, and that every public man, whatever be his position, owes to his country the purest and most conscientious exercise of all his faculties. Public life is equally a post of trust, whether on the right or the left hand of the Speaker's chair; and a senator who does not deem it necessary to be sound and true in his counsels till he is in office, forms a very low and vulgar estimate of his moral obligations.

But none of the above grounds for putting a favourable construction on a Statesman's tergiversation, can be considered applicable to the strange recantation made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget speech and his address to his constituents—especially the former. The financial policy, of which in that speech he so powerfully, lucidly, and gratuitously displayed the beneficial operation, is, we cannot forget, the policy which, for the last six years and up to the previous three months, he had been in the habit of vehemently denouncing as mistaken in principle and ruinous in its results. The facts which he stated to the House on that memorable Friday, are precisely the facts which year after year his opponents have been pressing on his attention. The conclusions which flow from these facts were as manifest and inescapable, and must have been as obvious to him in 1851 as in 1852. He cannot plead that his mind has never been strongly directed to the subject till now, for it is the subject on which he has been harping session after session, which has occupied the chief share of his attention and research, and which he has turned over and over, and handled with every conceivable manœuvre of perverse ingenuity. If he never examined it seriously and dispassionately till now, he has throughout been acting a most unworthy part; if, having so examined it, he came to Protectionist conclusions, how comes it that now in office he sees the matter in such a very different light? If, again, having so examined it, and seen then as he sees now, the hollowness of the Protectionist doctrines, he yet upheld them as a party weapon, then we say that history scarcely affords a more glaring example of double treachery—treachery to the political phalanx which he led—treachery to the country of which he was a sworn and chosen legislator.

We have no desire ever to make the retraction of error difficult, or the retreat from a false position unnecessarily painful and humiliating. We are willing to conclude that Mr. Disraeli's allegiance to the principles we have long defended is genuine

and final, and assuredly should be sorry to hunt him back to his former follies. We believe the views which it is impossible, in spite of all mystification, not to imagine were developed as his own in his budget-speech, to be the sincere and inevitable views of a man who regards these questions from the position, with the light, and under the grave responsibilities of office. But in admitting this, we can give Mr. Disraeli no absolution for his obstinate and wilful persistence in the advocacy of untenable opinions; and we can only acquit him of the most frightful and prolonged insincerity, by supposing him guilty of a degree of thoughtless levity in his mode of regarding and treating the great interests of the nation, which must for ever disqualify him for the position of a leading Statesman, and preclude him from obtaining the confidence of the English people.

Nor can we for a moment allow to pass, as becoming or admissible, the language which has on several occasions been held, both by Lord Derby and his lieutenant, "that, whatever be his own opinions, a statesman must conform to the spirit of his age;" "that such and such a line of policy would be the just and wise one, but that the country is not sufficiently alive to its justice or its wisdom to adopt it, and therefore that another system must be followed." Cases no doubt occur in all countries governed by free institutions, in which acquiescence in the will of the nation, or even in the deliberate decision of an adverse majority, is the clear duty of a statesman. Laws are often passed which even those who opposed them most energetically would not dream of repealing. Laws are often repealed, which those who defended them most stoutly would not dream of re-enacting. It may often be wise and right to accept a defeat as final and conclusive. Sir Robert Peel did this in the case of the Reform Bill, to which he had offered the most strenuous opposition. He bowed to the manifest determination of the country, and at once abjured all attempt to disturb it. "I accept that measure (said he) as the final settlement of a great constitutional question." Nor would it be a just or wise principle to lay down, that the opponents of a great revolution in our national policy are to be held disqualified from taking office under the new system of things which that change has introduced. Such perpetual exclusion from power of any class of statesmen is a thing foreign to our constitution, and would, in our opinion, be far from salutary. Conservative politicians may even be peculiarly valuable at the helm of affairs, when progress has been established as the principle and pole-star of the country's policy, provided only their former opposition to that principle was rational and patriotic, and their present acquiescence in it honest and without *arrière pensée*. But the language held by the present ministers, and the conduct they

seem disposed to follow, can be justified by none of these considerations. They never acquiesced in the free-trade policy inaugurated by Huskisson, continued by Sir R. Peel, and completed by their immediate predecessors. They never "accepted" the crowning enactment of 1846 "as the final settlement of a great constitutional question." On the contrary, they have repeatedly and incessantly declared it to be erroneous in principle and ruinous in its results; they have been perpetually endeavouring to undermine it, and defeat it by flank attacks, and have lost no opportunity of assuring the people that, if entrusted with power, they would reverse it. Had they, after so obstinate a contest as they waged in 1846, submitted to their defeat, and bowed gracefully to the decision of the country, there could be no reason why they should not now have formed an administration with credit and with promise. But they did not pursue this course; they kept themselves before the country as a Protectionist party; they solicited confidence and support on Protectionist principles; they took office as a Protectionist ministry; their cabinet was composed of men having no claim to confidence or attention, except as Protectionists; and for such men to say to the country—"We will retain power to upset and neutralize free trade, if you will enable us; or, if not, we will still retain power to consolidate it and carry it out," seems to us language alike without spirit and without shame. It is true that in England no statesman can bid defiance "to the spirit of the age," nor pursue a policy condemned by the opinion of the nation; but no honest men can be bound, or can bear, to carry out a policy which they regard, and have all along denounced as fatal to the nation's welfare; if the nation insists upon being ruined, they at least should refuse to be the instruments of its ruin. No statesman, with a particle of self-respect—none worthy to guide or govern a great people—would address them thus,—“Place me in power, that I may lead you to safety if I am allowed; but if this cannot be, place me in power, that I may at least be your leader to destruction!” When the country and the statesmen differ so widely as to what is salvation, and what is ruin, the dignity and duty of the statesman is not acquiescence, but retirement.

Finally, we deprecate the continuance of the present ministers in office, because we do not believe in their capacity to manage the affairs of a great empire. Lord Derby has been a prominent public character for a quarter of a century, but has never shone except in parliamentary warfare. * Mr. Disraeli's *cleverness* no one doubts; but steadiness of purpose, dignity of conduct, or lofty and consistent principles, are what his antecedents give us no right to expect from him. The Home Secretary is

an able, sincere, and conscientious lawyer, whom every one respects, but who has no experience in public life, and whose reputation has not risen since he took office. Of the rest, the best that can be said is, that they are unknown men—and likely to remain so. On the whole, it is probable that sixteen more incompetent men never sat in the Cabinet together. During the few months they have sat on the Treasury Bench, their blunders and solecisms have been many and glaring, and the proceedings of the Foreign Secretary have been utterly suicidal and self-damnatory. Even if they had a decided policy, and if that policy were sound, the credit, honour, and safety of the country would require a speedy transference of power to more competent and experienced hands.

But if we deprecate the continuance in office of Lord Derby's ministry, we should deprecate with scarcely less earnestness a revival of the former administration—especially under its former leader. At the point of time and of progress at which we are now arrived, Whig Government can never be else than an unreality: no genius can henceforth breathe into it any other than a feeble, artificial, and spasmodic life. A Reforming party is a permanent reality: a Whig party is only its accidental and transitory form. To struggle for the preservation of the form is to endanger the more valuable reality. We should be among the last to deny or to under-estimate the services rendered to the dearest interests of England by the great aristocratic Whig party during the century of its existence. It has kept a wholesome control over its rivals, and has saved them from many follies and from some crimes. It has supplied a rich galaxy of eminent and noble statesmen to our history; it has consolidated and widened both our civil and our religious liberties; it has stood between the living and the dead in fearful moments of pestilence and danger; it has at once ridden on and moderated the wave of popular demand, and has changed what might have been a bloody and abortive insurrection into a peaceful and salutary revolution; it has been like an Ark to our Constitution during a deluge of no ordinary violence and no short duration. But we do not read that Noah felt himself called upon, out of gratitude, to live in the ark after the deluge had subsided. We do not testify our sense of the services of the bows and spears which scattered our enemies at Agincourt and Crecy, by furbishing them up for the battles of to-day. We do not shew our respect for the superannuated veterans who fought half a century ago, by intrusting our defence now to their impaired vision and their enfeebled strength. We pension off the old warriors, and we hang up the antiquated armour, and the rusty firelocks which won our ancestral victories, and shew our gratitude by tender reverence, and

by untimely use. The worst way in which we can repay the services of patriots and statesmen who have swayed and adorned their day and generation, is by retaining them in a position in which they can only tarnish their former fame, and obliterate and cancel the memory of their former deeds. Now, everything which made the Whigs a party is told off into the historic past; their part is performed; the arena in which they distinguished themselves is changed; their arms and their banners are alike obsolete; their bonds of union are broken or dissolved; the timid and reactionary among them are Conservatives; the sanguine and enterprising among them are "something more" than Whigs; and a graceful euthanasia—a deathbed made beautiful by the devotion of a few clinging adherents unable to believe in the extinction of what was once so great—is all now left them. A resurrection, under new conditions, of the great Whig party, may be possible: a prolongation of its existence is not. Like its nobler prototype, "it cannot be quickened except it die."

Least of all is its revival possible or desirable under its late leader. Though an experienced tactician—a gallant and chivalrous colleague—a high-minded and honourable senator, Lord John Russell was the most complete partisan of his whole party. He worshipped Whig idols; he lived on Whig traditions; he measured everything by Whig compasses; he looked at everything through Whig spectacles; and could seldom rise high enough above the ideas and interests of party warfare, to contemplate any subject from a purely patriotic point of view. Since the commencement of the present year, too, his usual skill and judgment seem to have deserted him. His dismissal of his ablest colleague at a moment when difficulties of every kind were thickening around him; his violation of all constitutional courtesies and decorums, in producing the Queen's letter when justifying that dismissal; his unpardonable mistake in advising the Queen to intrust the formation of a new Government to Lord Derby when he saw fit to throw up the reins; and, lastly, the glaring factiousness and sudden whim of his opposition to the second reading of the Militia Bill, to the utter amazement and confusion of his own party, who, for the most part, refused to follow him in so indefensible a step;—all have contributed to lower him deplorably, and we fear irreparably, in public estimation. Had he at the time of his own resignation suppressed all natural feelings of pique and indignation—had he consented, as the French say, *de s'effacer*, and advised Her Majesty to send for Lord Clarendon, or Sir James Graham, or Lord Palmerston—which would have been the constitutional course to adopt, since his defeat was not owing to a Protectionist assault—the country might have arrived at the desirable result of a strong and united

Government, without having to pass through the dangerous and damaging ordeal of a ministry whose foreign policy is conducted by Lord Malmesbury, and whose finances are managed by Benjamin Disraeli—without being subjected to all the evils of a feeble Government in a crisis of singular exigence, and of a general election in a period of angry excitement.

Since, then, the interests, desires, and requirements of the country cannot be satisfied either by the continuance of the present ministry or by a recurrence to the former one, it remains only clearly to state what is the real desideratum of the time, and by what political combinations that desideratum can be supplied.

In a free and parliamentary Government, like that of England, there are two parties, inherent and undying—the Stationary and the Progressive—the party whose principle is Conservatism, and the party whose principle is Reform. The parties themselves are eternal: the forms, disguises, combinations, pretexts, battle-fields, they may assume are accidental and transitory. Their ideas are distinct, and too often antagonistic; they attract different orders of mind; they look at questions from opposite points of view; they are each the representatives of a truth—but a truth that is partial and imperfect till it has found its complement and counterpart.

The principle of Progress or Reform (as Mr. Moseley has well stated) is both instinctive and sound.

“It is the means by which the higher destiny of man has to be worked out. The doctrine of contentment—the proverb of ‘leave well alone,’ and such like, acting exclusively—is peculiarly that of the lower grades of the creation. In its full extent it is at variance with the first principle of the physical temperament of man as an individual; and, if carried out, were fatal to the destiny of man as a race. . . . Again, the principle of progress is boundless, endless in its operation; there is no moment of cessation; its work is never done. It may be weakened by the toil it imposes on itself, but never satisfied—never extinguished; for that which it longs after and lives for—perfection—is never to be enjoyed—never to be realized. Improvement in political wellbeing, as in other wellbeing, but leaves us still with desires—with the power of discerning further means of satisfying itself—new hopes—greater power, and consciousness of power, for achieving them.”

The principle which lies at the bottom of Conservatism, too, is equally instinctive, equally necessary, equally legitimate. It may often run into excess; it may often assume unamiable forms; it may often cling round unworthy objects; it may often manifest itself in unwise and untimely ebullitions; but at its root lies a beneficent and indisputable truth. There is the Con-

servatism of mere indolence, which shrinks from the effort and disturbance of a change, and hates to be aroused from its torpid and unserviceable slumber. There is the Conservatism of selfishness, which, finding that the existing state of things supplies its own low wants and satisfies its own small ideal, cares not how many millions might be made happy by a just and judicious innovation. There is the Conservatism of timidity, which clings to the familiar and the safe ; which fears to launch upon an untried sea ; and finds the most sanguine and brilliant prospect of a better, inadequate to counterbalance the faintest possibility of a worse. There is the Conservatism of poetry, which measures political good by sentiment and impression ; in whose votaries the feeling of veneration is stronger than that of aspiration : and which can deck the past more readily than the future with the gorgeous colouring of fancy. But there is also the Conservatism of wisdom, which knows how much there is of strength and virtue in the rooted and the old,—how much of danger and illusion in the gaudy attractions of the new ; which sees the price even more clearly than the blessing which it purchases ; which sits down to count the cost before it builds the tower ; and which has learned by long experience how often the substance is risked by grasping at the more seductive shadow. In fact, the principle of Conservatism is less a negation and antagonist of the principle of Progress, than a different side of the same shield—the other half of the same truth.

“ We have seen,” says Mr. Moseley, “ that Reform and Conservatism are true principles of all good government—that both are essential constituents of it. But the parties formed on these doctrines are severally combinations for carrying out—for giving effective operation to—*one only of these* ; or at least for giving to one a dominant, preponderating, if not exclusive, influence in the government of the country. Each of these parties, then, is grounded on a false theory. All who claim a truth exclusively as their own, or who profess to take one great truth as their rule of action, when the other, at least—though it be the antithesis of their own—is an essential principle of such government, place themselves in a false position. And all combinations formed on such a basis must be untrue to themselves, and deceive those who place confidence in them.”

Bearing in mind these considerations, we will now cast a glance over the *real* parties into which the English political world is now divided, ignoring those divisions which, though still ostensible, are merely or almost nominal, and passing over those minor but numberless distinctions which can never be absent among a nation of independent thinkers.

First, there are the Old Tories—the relics and survivors of the party that, so lately as thirty years ago, was dominant and

rampant. They are few in number, and far from standing high in public estimation; but they are not therefore to be altogether despised, and must not be overlooked among the elements of political calculations. In some parts of England, and among some classes, they have still great influence; they are often men of vast possessions and of attractive character; and, what is of still more consequence, there are several of their opinions with which the great mass of refined and cultivated English gentlemen have a ready and deep-seated, though a modified and tempered sympathy. They represent a permanent element in the national mind—they are the depositaries and expounders of a certain set of sentiments and ideas which are eminently British;—antique loyalty; unreasoning, and often irrational, attachment to the Church as an institution; instinctive *vis inertiae*; veneration for ancestral times; and hatred of *parvenus* and *parvenuism*. A few of these are to be found in the House of Commons—more in the House of Lords. They can never again govern the country: democracy and commerce are now both too strong;—but they can never be wholly without influence over those who do.

At the other extremity of the political gamut lies the Radical party, now almost merged in the Manchester School. This section is composed of men who are both numerous and influential; but whose numbers and influence are greater out of Parliament than in. They are men whom it would be well worth while for our Statesmen thoroughly to study and understand. They may be most useful, or most formidable, according as they are met and dealt with. They are men of unwearied activity and dauntless pertinacity. They have all the concentrated and unhampered energy which springs from earnest purpose and clear but narrow vision. They feel strongly and speak vehemently, because their knowledge is not thorough and their reflection is not deep. To them, every political difficulty is simple, every labyrinth plain, every problem easy of solution. They delight in and promulgate those broad views which are so seductive to presumptuous and uneducated masses—so shallow, so short-sighted, so dangerous, in the judgment of trained and thoughtful minds. They have, in their character and conformation, much of the Yankee and something of the Puritan—a combination most sure to command success, and most especially to be dreaded where the profound and subtle questions of the higher policy are at stake. In their eyes, every thing that is old has a *prima facie* case against it; every thing new, at least a high degree of probability in its favour. They have a quick eye and a keen satire for all past mistakes; and have no modesty or caution to make them shrink from the boldest experiments. They have a

vivid perception of all that is indefensible in theory, but are wholly without appreciation for the hidden compensations and counteractions which have caused even monstrous systems to produce valuable results. Their most valuable characteristic is their merciless and rude hostility to all abuses and all shams; their most pernicious quality is their disposition to try every thing by the lowest and most mercenary standard. They would overturn, without fear, the whole traditional policy of the nation; and, while unable to rise to a statesmanlike contemplation of Imperial questions, are prepared to set at nought international customs, to abjure all foreign relations, and to reverse and confound all colonial connexions. To some among them, the increased predominance of the democratic element in our Constitution is only a means towards the attainment of their ends: to others, it is an object of desire for its own sake; but by all it is steadily pursued. All are the advocates of vital and organic changes.

Between these two extremes stands the vast Eclectic party, neither conterminous with, nor represented by, any of the official and antique divisions in the Parliamentary chart—whether Whigs, Radicals, or Tories. It is composed of deserters from every section, and of men who never belonged to any section. It has been long, and of late rapidly, augmenting, and is now more numerous than any other, though its members are still scattered up and down in the ranks of every political denomination, from the want of a common banner and a central leader to rally round. As soon as such shall be found, its surpassing strength, both numerical, intellectual, and social, will be at once recognised. It comprises all those, bred in the old Tory camp, whose enlarged education had shewn them at once the narrowness of their paternal creed, and the no less untenable nature of the positions from which even what is true and sound in it has hitherto been defended; who have discovered that the retention of the old, without its modification and adaptation to an altered age, is only half the idea of a philosopher and half the duty of a statesman; and who are sincerely and nobly desirous to remove—even at their own cost and at the sacrifice of many prejudices—those abuses which have disfigured venerable institutions, and those excrescences and incrustations which have overgrown and hidden so much that is genuine, beautiful, and divine, in the hallowed legacies of the past. It comprises numbers among the Whigs, who are sick of an artificial bond, and weary of a hollow sham, and who dread the increasing temptation and tendency among their leaders to purchase a new ^{first} of life by unworthy coquetting and unholy alliances with a the party ^{to whom} their sympathies are only limited, casual, and

apparent. It comprises, too, many who, while ardently attached to the cause of progress and reform, yet fear the advance of democracy, as of two opposing dangers the most formidable and the most imminent; and who are anxious to resist it, not by obstruction and reaction towards the past, but by forestalling all its just demands, and so cutting away the ground from beneath its feet. It comprises, further, not a few, formerly known as zealous leaders in the vanguard of Radicalism, whose early illusions time and experience have dissipated, to whom age has brought sobriety of expectation, whom observation and reflection have made aware of perils and difficulties undreamed of in their sanguine youth, and who, while true at heart to the real and enduring attributes of their old idolatry, yet bring a purer oblation and worship at a statelier shrine. Its ranks are swelled by all those who, having conquered, one by one, every object for which they fought, having carried all the reforms they sought and valued, have now passed by a natural and legitimate transition from the body of assailants into that of defenders of the existing order of things. It includes, again, those experienced and influential men who, feeling how much has to be done, and how vast are the obstacles in the way of doing it, finding the day too short and their strength too slight for those practical improvements and those *imperative* reforms in which the immediate interests and welfare of millions are involved, shrink from entertaining the less urgent questions of organic change. Finally, it includes all those—so far more numerous out of Parliament than within its walls—who are turning with angry weariness and contemptuous loathing from party struggles and intellectual tournaments; whose voice is to be heard in every quarter of the empire and through every organ of opinion, calling upon our rulers to look to things, not names; to deeds and laws, not to watchwords and to war-cries; to leave aside and brush away the cobwebs and trivialities of faction; to cease sharpening and changing their tools, and to begin using them; to concentrate all efforts and attention on the real wants of the country; to foresee and provide against imperial perils; to grapple at once in a spirit of business-like and manful resolution with all those social evils and abuses which no one denies and which few defend; to approach the great questions of the day as problems to be solved at hazard of our national existence, not to seek in them missiles of mutual offence;—in fine, to gird up their loins for the heavy work before them, like men to whose genius, conscientiousness, and devotion, is entrusted the management of as grand a fragment of human destiny as was ever committed to human hands.

The great demand and desideratum of the country is a

STRONG GOVERNMENT—a Government imbued with these ideas, and consecrated to these aims—a Government which, exonerated by reason of its strength from the low and wasting necessities of hourly self-defence, should be able to address its whole capacities of conception and of execution, “to do the work that should be done.” Such a Government once formed—its banner raised, its leader chosen, its programme of policy announced—would find itself supported by recruits in unexpected multitudes and from unsuspected quarters. Men, now ranked among Conservatives, because their connexions lie in that line, and they have never yet openly thrown off their allegiance to party; men classed by public estimation among the Whigs, and reckoned by Whig leaders as forming part of their effective strength, and now acting with that section, partly from old habit, partly from unconsummated change: men sympathizing with the Radicals on many points, and voting with them on many questions, and never suspected of being Conservatives by temperament and at heart; all who are weary of unproductive strife, all who are sanguine of practical advance, will flock to the new standard and enlist under the new enrolment.

Who, then, will be the chief, and what should be the policy of this remodelled administration? The programme of its policy will decide in a great measure the men who are to compose it. As an indispensable preliminary we must suppose Lord John Russell removed to the Upper House. As long as he remains in the House of Commons he will be, we fear, an insuperable obstacle to such a re-organization and combination as the necessities of the country require. While there he is altogether too prominent and powerful not to fill the post of leader, and he cannot be the leader of such an administration as we are now contemplating. When he is removed we see no serious impediments to the formation of a ministry comprising, for example, Lord Clarendon, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Granville, Lord Carlisle, Lord Panmure, Mr. Labouchere, Lord Dalhousie, (when he returns,) and possibly Lord Palmerston, as principal members, and Mr. James Wilson, Mr. Cornwall Lewis, the Duke of Argyll, and Mr. Frederick Peel, and others, as secondary colleagues. Such a ministry would be one of conservative progress: the leading principles of their policy would be to grapple at once with those *practical social* questions on which so much of the immediate wellbeing of the country hangs, and to *postpone*, wherever possible, *those measures about which many wise and experienced men differ in favour of those about which nearly all wise and experienced men agree*. In dealing with these latter they will find work enough to engage all their genius, all their industry,

all their time, for many years to come. And when they have exhausted the catalogue of those things which every one feels ought to be done, which the national peace, comfort, and character require should be done, many of those questions which are now matters of doubt and discussion will either have solved themselves, or time and experience will have paved the way for a far nearer agreement as to the mode of treating them than is now possible.

Such a cabinet would agree in the essential points of their *foreign policy*: they are all men whose attachment to the principles of constitutional liberty is undoubted, and who yet have never tampered with democratic excess. Their sympathies would, we know, be enlisted on the side of justice, freedom, and humanity abroad, while at the same time they have all repeatedly avowed their adhesion to that great rule which is to govern the international relations of this empire in future—non-interference with the internal affairs of other countries ourselves, and steady, unswerving, severe discouragement of such interference on the part of others. The names of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Carlisle would be an ample intimation to those governments whose brutal cruelty is now the opprobrium of Europe, that from England they could expect only the countenance of deep disgust and the language of unmixed disapprobation; the presence of Lord Clarendon and Lord Granville would be a guarantee for a conduct of mingled gentleness and firmness; while the support of Lord Palmerston, which we are satisfied would not be wanting, would be surety enough that the just claims and rights of British subjects would be everywhere watched over and enforced. And more than all, such a ministry would be able to speak with the confidence and the weight arising from the conviction, both on their own part and on that of foreign governments, that they spoke the sentiments, and were backed by the sympathy, of the whole British nation.

Such a cabinet would agree in the principles of their *financial and commercial* policy. They are all resolute free-traders; they are all pledged to carry out, to its full legitimate consequences, the system which they all helped to inaugurate. At the same time they will all be willing to meet the claims of any suffering interest, as soon as the justice of those claims can be made good. On minor points of fiscal arrangements it is possible they may differ; but they are all agreed upon the vast importance, at the present time, of considering deeply, and settling definitively, the fundamental principles on which future taxation should proceed. They will not be content every year to surrender a surplus to the most fierce and noisy claimant for relief—to take off now a trifle in one direction, now a trifle in another; to coquet first

with direct, and then with indirect taxation, without any clear comprehension or fixed opinion of the preferable advantages of either; or to base any new impost on the lazy and vicious system of exemptions. They will be anxious to place our future revenue on something like a scientific foundation, feeling that all change in such matters is an evil, but that change guided by fluctuating motives, and proceeding in no uniform direction, is an unmitigated mischief; and before they lightly give away the rare and undervalued treasure of a surplus, they will consider well whether such surplus ought not to be constant, and to be accumulated for purposes of ultimate and permanent relief.

They are agreed on the great and now urgent and hopeful question of *legal reform*. On this some of them are known to be deeply in earnest. With Lord Cranworth or Sir John Romilly as Chancellor, they have, in this line, a career before them, in which they may confer more signal blessings, and reap a richer fame than has fallen to the lot of any ministry for many generations. In the complete extirpation of Chancery enormities; in the extension and consolidation of cheap law courts; in the merciless abolition of the actual ecclesiastical tribunals; in grappling with the vast and difficult question of secondary punishments; in establishing some system for the disposal of juvenile offenders which shall neither shock common sense, common humanity, or common justice,—which shall at once rescue these miserable victims, and take away the motive to their creation;—lies work sufficient to task all their energies, to satisfy all their aspirations, to occupy all their thoughts; while, as none of these are party questions, and as it would be iniquity to make them such, they may call on all sections of the political world, their opponents as well as their adherents, to aid them, in a spirit not of rivalry, but of collaboration, in toils in which every Englishman has a common and an equal interest.

Next comes the great subject of *Colonial Policy*. This—though much personality has been mixed up with colonial discussions—has scarcely yet become a distinct arena for party strife, and we earnestly trust will never be made so. It presses, not so much for immediate action, as for prompt attention with a view to the determination of principles, and the fixation of views which as yet are, with most men, floating and indefinite. Whether England's colonial empire shall be cut adrift as a burden, or cherished as a jewel, a glory, and a strength; what is the nature and extent of that self-government which should be conceded to the colonies; and what is the fitting time and mode for that concession; whether, while managing their own concerns, as soon as they are qualified to do so, they should be further bound up in our Imperial circle by sending representa-

tives to the Parliament of the mother country; on what basis the relative claims of the settlers and the aborigines are to be adjusted; what amount of protection the colonies can fairly demand from us, and what portion of their defence they must provide for themselves;—all these are questions, though of paramount importance, and of no small difficulty, *rather to be inquired into and studied*, than to be fought about in St. Stephens. They are matters which all may join in helping forward to a decision; and the decision of which will marvellously narrow the future field of faction, and prodigiously aid the development and the peace of the empire.

Surely here is work enough to be done, without looking further into the future, without embarking on the waters of factious bitterness and strife, without raking up the mud that lies at the bottom of the dirty pool of party politics. But there is a question, about which much has been said, and about which something is felt,—a question which recent proceedings have made it difficult either to shelve or to postpone,—that of Parliamentary Reform. Now we think that it would not be difficult to draw out a Reform Bill—very different indeed from the crude and wretched proposition introduced by Lord John Russell at the beginning of the session—which such a ministry as we have suggested might unanimously adopt,—which it would be wise for them to bring forward and easy for them to carry,—which would command the support of the Liberals as an undeniable improvement on the present system, and which might reasonably look for the consent of the Tories, both on the ground of its intrinsic merits, and as far preferable to what they must be prepared to submit to, if the Whigs should again regain ascendancy, and find it desirable to bid high for radical support. There are many points in the actual arrangement both of the franchise and the representation which are felt by *all* parties as evils which ought to be removed, and anomalies which cannot be defended—there are practical improvements in the electoral system, which have never been made party questions, and have scarcely even been brought before the public, but which, as soon as suggested, would be recognised by every one as most valuable and salutary; and there are modes of *extending* the franchise without *lowering* it, which, when once proposed, would be felt to be at all events safe and serviceable approaches to the solution of one of the most perplexing problems which beset the friends of a reform in the great vital organ of the State. A bill embodying these amendments, which Sir James Graham and Mr. Gladstone might honourably, and without compromise, join in proposing, which Lord John Russell and Mr. Cobden could not help supporting, (though it might be under protest as not going far enough,) and

which Lord Derby could scarcely find any decent pretext for opposing, would, we believe, be at once a great source of strength and popularity to the administration, and a substantial and permanent blessing to the country.

Such, in brief, are our notions as to the political wants of the nation, and the best means of supplying them. The new Parliament will show what are the chances of seeing our hopes fulfilled. We have left ourselves no space to speak of the books placed at the head of this Article. That of Mr. Moseley contains much good sense, many sound views, many useful suggestions; but it is sadly languid and wordy, and the style is loose, rambling, and inelegant. The work of Mr. Cornewall Lewis is of a far higher order and has a different scope. It is scientific in its object and arrangement, and is full of solid thought and extensive learning. But it would be doing it great injustice to treat of it at the fag-end of a paper on practical policy.

INDEX

TO THE

SEVENTEENTH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

A

ALBERT, PRINCE, his Industrial College of Arts and Manufactures. *See* Industrial College.

Alfred, King, 145—the two great elements of our race, 145—original condition of mankind one of culture, 146—difference between a rude and a savage people, 147—youth of Alfred—journey to Rome, 150—his mysterious disease, 152—his relations with the Church, 155—his first interview with Asser, monk of St. David's, 156—character of his literary works, 159—his political institutions, 161—his Protestantism, 163—merits of Dr. Pauli's book—character of the Rev. J. A. Giles' "Life of Alfred," 163.

American poetry, 394—its general character, 394—Longfellow, 395—Bryant, 406—Thomas Buchanan Read, 409—Edgar Poe, 414—mediocrity of American poets, 417—recommendations, 417.

Anglo-Catholics found their tenets upon the Liturgy, 377.

Aquilonius on binocular vision, 169, *note*.

Archæology. *See* Primeval.

Asser, monk of St. David's, his connexion with King Alfred, 156.

Auchterarder case, statement of, 255.

Australia, Ornithology of, 334.

B

Balmes, Rev. J., leader of a new intellectual school in Spain, 105—aims at the internal revival and restoration of the Spanish Church, 105—his work on civilisation reviewed, 105.

Baptismal regeneration, 384—no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament, 384.

Binocular vision and the stereoscope, 165— inventions have stolen their infancy and manhood, 166—Leonardo da Vinci's observations, 167—each eye sees dissimilar pictures of solids, 169—Mr. Wheatstone's theory of the stereoscope erroneous, 171—Sir David Brewster's law of visible direction, 175—history of his lenticular stereoscope, 177—his theory of the stereoscope, 178—method of taking accurate binocular pictures, 180—why the perspective of a picture is best seen with one eye, 183—influence of size in lenses, 183—monocular and binocular portraits incorrect, 185—method of uniting the two,

185—superiority of the lenticular stereoscope, 187—use of the stereoscope to painters and sculptors, 189—photographical pictures combined by the stereoscope, 191—effects of the union of similar pictures, 192—illusions resulting from this union, 195—conversion of relief, cameos and intaglios, 197—inversion of form, single and binocular cameoscopes, 199—chromatic stereoscope, relief from colour, 200—binocular perspective, theory of a picture, 202.

Brain, its relation to the mind, 44.

Brewster, Sir David, account of his stereoscopes, 176.

British statesmanship and policy, prospects of, 1—requirements and dangers of the day, 3—list of potential statesmen, 4—materials for future cabinets, 6—administrators wanted rather than legislators, 11—real irresponsibility of ministers, 12—cause of the scanty supply of public men, 16—character of middle-class representatives, 17—undesirableness of Parliamentary life, 18—administrative genius and dialectic skill seldom meet in one mind, 21—bounded sympathies of London senators, 27—union of the two functions of the Lord Chancellor, 28—remedy for existing evils, 30—need of *ex officio* seats, 33—suggestion as to unrecognised statesmen, 35—Henry Taylor's opinion, 36—temper of Mr. Roebuck's work, 39.

Burns, Robert, his interview with Walter Scott, 284—Francis Jeffrey attracted by the sight of him on the High Street of Edinburgh, 284.

Bryant, W. C., review of his "Thanatopsis," 406.

C

Cabinets, materials for future, 5.

Calamus, its origin and use in the Church, 119.

Cameoscopes, single and binocular, 199.

Carlyle's Latter-Day Pamphlets reviewed, 1. Chalmers, Dr., Memoirs of, 205—the man of an epoch, 205—a great man, 206—distinguished for *momentum*, unity of intention, transparent simplicity, 208—conflict between the man and the Christian, 209—conquest over the idolatry of self, 211—the secret of his power lies in the concentration of his faculties, and their subordination to the higher purposes of his

life, 213—relative religious condition of England and Scotland in his time—moderation, 214—religious revival and the Westminster Confession, 216—his evangelic mission, 217—ordinary pulpit style, 219—his personal influence, 221—influence in the professorial chair, 223—preference of the chair to the pulpit, 227—impulse communicated to the ministerial mind of Scotland, 230—his function as a systematic philanthropist, 232—his advocacy of establishments, 237—harmony between the principle of establishments and the principles resulting in the Disruption, 233—Dr. Chalmers's connexion with it misunderstood, 244—the Veto Law, 254—Non-intrusion controversy, 253—his part in the Disruption, 275.

Church of England, liturgical reform in, 369.
Church Establishments, Dr. Chalmers's advocacy of, 237—light thrown upon the question by the Disruption, 278.

Church of the middle ages, its effects on European society, 114.

Civilisation, progress of, under Popery and under Protestantism, 110.

Clarendon, Lord, qualifications as a statesman, 5.

Cockburn's "Life of Jeffrey" reviewed, 283.
Combe, George, review of his "Constitution of Man," 41.

D

Despotism, priestly, effects of, upon a nation, 125.

Disruption of the Scottish Establishment, 239—essential differences between the Scotch and English Reformation and the established forms of worship, 240—absurd to subject the two to the same treatment, 243—increase of the evangelical party, 245—the outcry against patronage a necessary result, 246—the Call of the people, 247—rendered a nullity, 249—different proposals for giving effect to it, 250—the Veto Law, 251—warmly commended by Lord Brougham, 252—Non-intrusion controversy, 253—the Auchterarder case, 255—the two parties in the Church, 257—the temper of statesmen, 259—the preceding events, 263—the pleas of Government, 265—reason of the Disruption, 267—English and Scotch Church principle, 269—the Headship, 269—co-ordination practicable, 272—problems involved in the Disruption, 277—Church Establishments, 278—waste of religious organization, 279—fiscal economy of the Free Church, 281.

E

Earle, Sullivan, review of his Life of Albert Arnold, 71.

Establishments, Religious, Chalmers's advocacy of, 237—in harmony with the

principles which resulted in the Disruption, 238.

Exhibition of 1851, statistical details of, 531—its results, 542.

F

France, industrial education in, 523—the first exhibiting nation in the Crystal Palace, 545.

G

Giles, Rev. J. A., character of his Life of King Alfred, 163.

Gladstone, Mr., his qualifications as a statesman, 5.

Gould, John, his "Birds of Australia" reviewed, 327.

H

Hall, James, notice of his paper on binocular perspective, 202.

Hanna, Dr., review of his Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers, 205.

Hensler, Madame, her Life of Niebuhr, 422.
Hexameters next to impossible in a language like ours, 397.

Holland, New, birds of, 334.

I

Industrial College of Arts and Manufactures proposed by Prince Albert, 519—neglect of industrial education in England, 521—Industrial institutions of France, 523—Account of the *Ecole Centrale des Arts*, 524—decline of English science, 531—resolution to establish a great Central College of Industry, 547—relation between abstract science and art, 549—views of Liebig and Humboldt, 553—Minster's pledge to develop industry, art, and science, 557.

J

Jeffrey, Cockburn's Life of, 233—merits of the biography, 297—his boyhood, 298—juvenile performances, 299—"command of language," 300—residence at Glasgow and Oxford, 301—political condition of Scotland, 304—Lord Melville the *Pharos* of Scotland, 304—Jeffrey attaches himself to the Scottish Whig party, 305—professional life, 307—the Edinburgh Review, 309—his understanding of Scottish Whiggism, 311—qualifications as a critic, 316—specimens, 319—new era in British literature, 325.

Lenticular Stereoscope, account of its invention by Sir D. Brewster, 176—its superiority, 187.

Leonardo da Vinci on binocular vision, 167.
Life and Chemistry, 151—the Lord of science, 153—the chemical elements, 155—chemistry of exorganic forms, 156—only analytical, not synthetical, 158—

- histological physiology, 141—the brain and the nervous system, 142—Swedenborgian physiology, 143.
- Lewis, G. Cornewall, his work on the "Method of observation and reasoning in Politics" reviewed, 559.
- Liturgical reform in the Church of England, 369—unrivalled excellence and beauty of the liturgy, 369—the cause of this, 370—the Church of England a Church of compromise, and with this view the liturgy was framed, 372—Parliament averse to making changes on the liturgy, 373—an age of religious earnestness, adverse to compromise, 375—the liturgy the bulwark of Anglo-Catholics, 377—the Athanasian Creed, 379—no error of doctrine in the burial service, 381—objection to the absolution in the service for the visitation of the sick, 381—the ordination service, 383—the service for infant baptism, 384—Sacerdotalism, 384—fatal objection to the present baptismal service, 387—authority for infant baptism, 391—the language of the Apostolic Church does not apply to infant baptism, 392—importance of exegesis, 392.
- Longfellow, H. W., criticism of his poetry, 395.

M

- Monastic Orders, services of, in multiplying books, and in redeeming Christian slaves, 117.
- Moseley, Joseph, his "Political Elements, or the progress of Modern Legislation" reviewed, 559.

N

- Niebuhr, Life and Letters of, 422—his boyhood, 423—intelligence and information, 425—master of twenty languages, 427—philology and history his favourite studies, 428—first residence at Copenhagen, 431—his opinion of London and Edinburgh, 433—his marriage, 435—his political life in Prussia, 436—Lectures on Roman History at Berlin, 438—his own opinion of the first volume of his history, 440—Niebuhr and Goethe's opinions of one another, 441—second marriage and mission to Rome, 443—opinion of Rome and its inhabitants, 444—his son, opinions as to infant training, 445—life and lectures at Bonn, 447—illness and death, 449—impressions of his character, 450—his religion, 455—merits and defects as a historian, 456.

O

- Ornithology, 327—pleasure derived from the study, 328—numerical amount of species, 328—the condor of the Cordilleras the largest, 330—the Tringa the most widely extended, 332—the repre-

sentative species, 333—birds of Australia, 335—special features of Australian Ornithology, 338—the buzzard, 339—bower-birds, the parrot, 341—the pigeon, 343—mound-building birds, 345—swimming birds, 346—pelicans and cormorants, 349—birds of Ireland, 350—migratory movements of birds, 351—geographical distribution, 353—effect of industrial operations on birds, 355—eagles, 356—hawks and owls of Ireland, 359—in-social or perching birds, 360—thrushes and titmice, 363—the crow, the magpie, 364.

P

- Parliament, Mr. Carlyle's view of, 23.
- Parliamentary life, undesirableness of, 18.
- Pauli, Dr. Reinhold, his biography of King Alfred reviewed, 145.
- Periodical Literature, recent change in, 323.
- Photography, benefit of the stereoscope in, 131.
- Phrenology, its place and relations, 41—general view of Combe's "Constitution of Man," 41—its relation to religion, 43—relations of the brain and the mind, 45—the pretension of Phrenology to point out not only the *places where* but the *manner how* the brain and mind are connected, 47—new light thrown upon old and tawdry doctrines by phrenological jargon, 48—organs as indications of character, 51—size and activity of the organ, 52—phrenology and moral science, 55—Mr. Combe's three sources of crime, 56—if man is the victim of his nature, punishment inadmissible, 58—phrenology and religion, 61—spiritual beliefs, 63—Mr. Combe's key to the true theory of the divine government, 66—evils of our social system, 67—chief fault of Mr. Combe's work, 69.
- Playfair, Dr. Lyon, on the decline of science in England, 531—lecture on the results of the Exhibition, 544.
- Poe, Edgar, criticism of his poetry, 414.
- Political Parties, crisis of, 559—present condition of our "political elements," 559—fatal equipoise, 551—danger of a lax morality among public men, 564—Mr. Disraeli's recantation indefensible, 568—unworthy language of Lord Derby, 569—prolongation of the Whig party not desirable, 571—the real parties in England, 573—the Grand Desideratum, the Eclectic party, 576—its composition, 578—its policy, 579.
- Portraiture and Sculpture, application of the stereoscope to, 177.
- Primeval Archæology of Britain, 459—importance of the science, 459—estimate of Dr. Wilson's work, 460—aims of the science, 462—the stone period, 463—its

remote antiquity, 467—the bronze period, 469—the races of these periods, 473—the “stone” men Allophylians, 475—two Allophylian or ante-Celtic races, 477—bronze probably of Gaelic introduction, 479.

Protestant divisions indicative of freedom and intellectual activity, 129.

Protestantism and Romanism compared in their effects on civilisation, 110.

R

Read, T. B., criticism of his poetry, 409.

Roebuck's “History of the Whig Administration of 1830” reviewed, 1.

Romanism, errors of, 481—Archbishop Whately's “Cautions for the Times,” 482—specimens of successful refutation of Popish errors, 484—the *new* and the *old* religion, 484—private judgment, 485—worship of saints and the Virgin, 486—transubstantiation, 488—Popery confirms the depraved tendencies of human nature, while Protestantism opposes them, 493—superstition, 494—extreme unction and purgatory, 497—vicarious religion, 497—pious frauds, 499—infallibility, 501—origin of Romish errors, 502—persecution, 506—self-righteousness, 509—views of the Reformers to the time of Bishop Bull, 510—Bishop O'Brien on justification, 513—Cardinal Bellarmine and Bishop Bull, 515—the true author of Popery, 517.

Romanism and European civilisation, 105—connexion of the Roman Church with European progress, 107—the terms Catholic and Christian synonymous with Balmez, 109—the Church of the Empire, 113—the Church and the Barbarians, 115—emancipated the body but enchained the soul, 118—the cup and calamus, 119—civilizing effects of the two elements as manifested in Spain and Great Britain, 121—priestly despotism, 125—partial civilisations, 127—Protestant divisions, 129.

S

Sacerdotalism the prolific source of almost every corruption, 384.

Saxons, character of the, in the days of Alfred, 147.

Scotchmen, century of eminent, 284—their classification, 286—*Scotticism* of Scotchmen, 287—peculiarity of Scottish as compared with English thought, 291—Scottish influence in philosophy, 293—in literature, 295—Scottish Whiggism, 311—Scottish criticism, 315.

Spain, effects of Popery on, 123.

Statesmen, survey of present and prospective British, 4—qualifications required in, 22.

Stereoscope, its history, construction, and application, 166—superiority of the lens-ticlar, 167.

Swedenborg's description of what poetical language should be, 419.

T

Taylor, Henry, his work entitled “The Statesman” reviewed, 1.

Thompson, William, review of his *Natural History of Ireland*, 327—short notice of his works, 327, *note*.

Tractarian poison insidiously conveyed in stories for the young, 72.

V

Village life in England, 71—books for the poor, 71—Tractarian story-books, 72—Mr. Sullivan Earle's “Gilbert Arnold,” 74—“Companions of my Solitude,” 75—communication between rich and poor, 75—duties of the English housewife, 78—antidote to the alehouse, 89—houses for the poor, 81—condition of the daughters of the poor, 81—great sin of great cities, the source often lies in rural districts, 82—seduction, 85—judicious treatment at the turning point of the career, 87—employment of females, needlework, 91—evils in the management of village shops, 93—duty of the rich to employ their poorer neighbours, 94—the schoolmaster, 96—lending libraries, 97—savings club, 98—remissness of the clergy, 99—opportunities for good, 101—claims of the poor and duties of the rich, 103.

Voss, the poet, his connexion with Niebuhr, 425, 430—Niebuhr's opinion of his poetry, 430.

W

Whately, Archbishop, on the “Errors of Romanism”—*see* Romanism—defects of his work, 493.

Wheatstone, Charles, his theory of binocular vision, 167.

Whiggism, Scottish, 310—Jeffrey's theory of, 313.

Wilkinson, J. J. G., review of his work on the Human Body and its connexion with Man, 131—a disciple of Swedenborg, 133.

Wilson, Daniel, LL.D., his work on Archæology reviewed, 459.

Worsaae, J. J. A., his “Primeval Antiquities of Denmark” reviewed, 459.

